

HOUSE OF LORDS #12

This is *House Of Lords*, a zeen by, for and about publishing and publishers, GMing and GMs. It runs no games, and is available to just about anybody. It's composed primarily of the thoughts of its publisher, and an array of letters on topics relevant to publishing a dipzeen in the modern world. Hopefully, this is a forum for those with experience to share the wealth.

You can get this zeen any of several ways. First of all, by sending me one American Dollar per issue. Second, by trading publications with me. Third, agree to run this off for me (at no cost to myself, and in the manner to which I have become accustomed). Might as well keep on trying. NonGMpubbers are obviously limited to the first option only, having nothing to trade (too bad).

I also expect a fair amount of participation from all of you out there. This zeen sinks or swims on the basis of your contributions.

And your publisher for this evening is Dick Martin, 26 Orchard Way N, Rockville, MD 20854-6128.

Each subheading has at one time been the subject of a New Business "feature." That's how we choose topics, more or less. If you'd like to see a particular topic discussed, just write a couple paragraphs worth of your opinions on the subject to get the ball rolling and we'll go with it.

Announcements

The Prince has been revived by Jim Meinel (PO Box 240003, Anchorage, AK 99524) and will feature Alaska news, a dip game, and low-grade printing.

Globetrotter is by Derek Caws (The Old Kitchen, Bere Farm House, North Boarhunt, nr Fareham, Hants, PO17 6JL, UK) and exists to promote an international Dip convention. Derek seems to think the idea originated in *Mad Policy*. But I won't hold that against him. That long address is ridiculous, though!

Julie has signed up to be the next MNC under the covenant. Stay tuned for further details.

Next *HOL* will be the "junk mail issue." The plan is to send it out as another blanket mailing to publishers. If you've got something you'd like to send out to a bunch of pubbers (mostly North American), ranging from announcements to project ideas to whatever, let me know. I'll be happy to include your stuff too. Already booked are Conrad von Metzke, Pesky Peel, and little ole me. I'll cover printing if you chip in a few pennies for postage? Go ahead, use your imagination on this one. If response is good enough, this could become a regular "feature" (maybe every six months or so).

One thing I plan to include in the mass mailing is a publishers' survey, asking all sorts of nosy questions. If you can think of any questions you'd like me to include, let me know and I may toss them on there too.

Would you like me to distribute the next Peeripoll in there too, Larry?

Past topics here include:

Archives ★★★ Do we need an organized archives of Dipdom materials, and if so how do we go about it.

Census ★★★ Organizational stuff for the last census. Long discontinued. Would you like to revive it, Conrad?

The Concept ★★★ A catch-all category for stuff that doesn't seem to fit anywhere else.

Costs ★★★ How much does it cost to put out

your zeen, run your games, or whatever. Suggestions on how to save money.

Dipcon ★★★ The care and feeding of Dipcon, lately featuring an international angle.

Diptax ★★★ Methods of raising money for dipdom services, including the now-infamous "diptax" proposal, and whether fund-raising is a good idea in the first place.

Ethics ★★★ Was never intended to address the particular ethics of certain individuals, but rather

(continued on page 27)

The Concept

(KEN PEEL) I think Steve Emmert missed Olsen's point on the quality of press one finds these days in *Retal.*, written primarily by relative newcomers to Dipdom (uneuphemistically known as simple novices). I think that Bob's point was not "How strange!...and not even GoldenAgers!!"

His point was to debunk the theory (which a surprising number of people hold) that it is the old timers that continue to carry the flame of good press, and that all these young whippersnappers just don't have what it takes. Au contraire. Good press comes from the chemistry of a game that hits just right. All good press requires is a group of players willing to produce it. The GM has a role to play in the process by keeping the game moving at a decent clip and by goading players in a positive sense by wading into the press himself...although I have to admit that I have seen circumstances where a GM can be a negative factor press-wise.

My feeling is that good press depends on the development of a special chemistry in a game, and that such a chemistry is actually more likely to be found in a game dominated by newcomers with energy and fresh ideas. And if it is in a zeen hidden away from Burgess, Williams and the Cochises, so much the better.

(BOB OLSEN) What—me a Golden Ager?! That's an outrage! Who is this guy Emmert anyway...why, if I could get up out of this chair, I'd whup him upside his head with my cane, and soundly box his ears! Then again, I suppose 1979 was a Golden Age of sorts...before the Dark Time. Before Williams.

But really, Steve, no offense; I was just trying to be nice! Fact is, the people who have come into Dipdom the past several years haven't really been particularly press-oriented, and it is good to see people coming in, even if they are smartasses like Steve Emmert, who want to write press. As for Steve's claim to be the best press writer around, well... as Larry Bird once sneered to Magic Johnson, "OK, Magic, let's see what you got!"

(REX MARTIN) As for the "flyer," I have enclosed several copies for you. As you can see, it carries an ad for the game on one side, and a brief mention of playing-by-mail on the other—referring folk to *Diplomacy World*. We felt it to be the most stable base to disseminate information, as it is likely to continue, even if under a different

publisher/editor. Larry has put together a "sampler," and will handle the hard work of answering these folk and being their first contact with this motley crew of hobbyists. As for our company efforts, these flyers are being enclosed in the *Diplomacy* games we are now packaging and selected other titles. Quite a few will be sent out to our wholesale distributors, who will hopefully pass them along to retail outlets which will place them near the game section of their stores. And your ranks of dedicated players could check to see that they are there, and ask if they have them. Of course, we will have the flyer at our booths at the major conventions we attend (the likes of *Origins*, *Gen-Con*, *Pointcon*, etc). I use them now to answer the several letters I get each week about the pbm hobby.

So, with some luck, the word will spread that there are a fair number of people who play the game by mail.

The brief "Infiltrator's Report" announcement of your zeens will appear in Vol 23, No 4 of *The General* (out late March/early April). Perhaps you might encourage others among the readership of *HOL* to pass along samples of their efforts to me if they haven't done so already. I can usually find room to make mention of them if they are the least bit deserving.

[Ok, everybody, consider yourselves encouraged. If you're interested in some new subbers, *The General* is the best place to start looking.

[I think Tom Shaw sent most of you a copy of the flyer. If you didn't get one, let me know. Pretty good, huh?]

(RUSS RUSNAK) First of all, I want to make a formal protest about the last *HOL*. When *HOL* first came out, you stated that it was not to be a name-calling type of zeen. Yet in the last issue, you printed a statement by Caruso that he saw no reasonable argument to oppose a GM confirmation of a player's draw vote. This statement implies that my arguments in *HOL* #10, as well as myself, are unreasonable. Since you printed his statements, you are held equally guilty. I expect formal apologies from both of you. Come to think of it, Linsey chimed in with Caruso, you can add him to the list as well. Caruso and Linsey together at last, and it took a midwesterner to do it.

I don't understand what you mean by Elmer having a captive audience. If his people are interested, they could find us without too much trouble. Also, if we were really determined to raid his ranks, that could be accomplished without too

much trouble. For whatever reason, people are willing to pay Elmer what we consider an exorbitant amount of cash for a Diplomacy game. If it really bothers you, don't hold it against him. Instead, try convincing his players that they can get the same for less.

[Well, Russ, they say that truth is an absolute defense against libel. Since you *are* unreasonable, you got no beef, y'hear?

[Once somebody pays \$\$ (or ££) for a game, they're a lot less likely to just drop it if a cheaper opening comes to their attention. I have no idea how effective Elmer is at actually recruiting people for *Kaissa*, though, so this is probably a very minor problem. Funny thing is, I've had *more* new subbers since I doubled my *Retal* sub rates (we're still pretty cheap, though).]

(PETER SULLIVAN) Why is the British Hobby slowing down? I suppose it's because zeens are getting larger, and hence turnaround is lengthening—on average about one to two weeks, I'd guess. There seems to be a reluctance to close waiting lists whilst people are willing to sign up, and editors tend to run a few more games than they'd really like. Your point about non-Diplomacy games not needing such long deadlines as Diplomacy is a good one; although in *Railway Rivals* and *Sopwith* (to take two of the most popular games) negotiation can pay dividends, many players seem to play them "gunboat style," with little or no negotiation going on.

Two-weekly zeens have been tried; *Back to the Dark Ages* managed to run up to 20 games for some 35 issues, and in the end, it was printing problems rather than time which caused it to fail. Having played in a game there, I got the impression that the other players thought it was gunboat (apart from one player, who wrote a lot—the other five managed one letter between them in 14 seasons!). How about a weekly zeen running two or three no-negotiation games by flyer?

[A weekly zeen over here would require quite a bit of phone use, and usually that'd be enough to scare me away. It has been done, though, and may be done again some day. Zeens with less than four week deadlines are rare, as are zeens with more than five week deadlines. We're pretty uniform.

[Having played in a couple non-dip games by mail, I think they benefit from a slightly faster turnaround. Not too much faster, though—three weeks for a non-negotiation game is just about

right. How much time does it take an average British zeen to hit the mails after the deadline?]

(SIMON BILLENNESS) *HOL* seems to be working out very well. I was worried that you weren't getting much new blood into the zeen, but I can now see that you are recruiting new contributors like Bruce Geryk and Stephen Dorneman. I do an occasional zeen review column in *Mad Policy*, to try and encourage British hobbyists to check out North American zeens. Do you mind if I give you a plug, mentioning that you'd prefer regular contributors rather than just more trades?

Peter Sullivan is right about British zeens being more infrequent than American ones, but he is wrong when he says the British hobby is slowing down further. There had been a steady decline in the frequency of British zeens, but a couple of years ago the situation turned around. After years of moaning about zeens slipping into five- and six-weekers, editors, on the whole, made an effort to improve their zeens' frequency. Newer, faster zeens contributed to this backlash, including *Back to the Dark Ages*, which ran no-frills Diplomacy games to two-week deadlines. As you expected, it quickly developed "a small but rabid following." Apparently the latest *Mad Policy* frequency survey confirms the increased frequency trend, but I suspect British zeens are, on the whole, larger but less frequent than zeens in America.

I don't know why Bill Salvatore thinks that British gamers are "completely alien." I admit the bright-green skin is a little disconcerting at first, but don't you think the eye-stalks are cute?

The "Karma League" was a small group of Diplomacy players who attempted to create a kind of masonic organization within the hobby in the early 1970s. "Karmas," as they called themselves, were supposed never to attack each other in Diplomacy games, thus giving them an unfair advantage over the other players. The League apparently attracted tremendous criticism because they undermined the basic diplomatic and free-wheeling aspect of the game. By the time I entered the hobby in the late 70s, the Karma League had entirely died out, and good riddance!

However, it is true that British Diplomacy players do have a different playing style. I notice with surprise that in a recent issue of *The Dragon's Lair*, the country with the best performance in North American Diplomacy is England. This is in complete contrast to British games where, according to the recent tables in the British statszeen *The Number's Game*, England lags in fifth

place, with Russia, Germany, and France clearly leading. English players obviously don't know how to play England!

[Eye stalks are fine, they just take a little getting used to.]

[Could you send me a copy of your *Mad Policy* review? I'm curious to see what you say about this thing. And I don't mind just ordinary trades, really. My trades with *C'est Magnifique* and *Bohemian Rhapsody* would have been worth it even if Peter and Malcie Baby didn't write.]

(STEPHEN DORNEMAN) I, too, would like to hear Pete Gaughan's story of the incorporation of *Perelandra*. I just received a copy of the zeen, and I was surprised not to see a copyright notice anywhere in the issue. Considering all the other trouble Pete's gone to to professionally restart *Perelandra*, I'm surprised he didn't take this simple step to protect his and his contributor's rights. After all, the notice of copyright is enough to give you quite a fair amount of protection under the current law without sending your zeen (and attendant fees) to the copyright office for complete protection.

[Ask, and ye shall receive....]

(PETE GAUGHAN) I need the readers' collective opinion on whether a five-month break is sufficient to disqualify *Perelandra* from "continuous publication since June, 1982."

Okay, "professional publishing." I have a checking account with no fee for the first six months—this could just as easily be a separate column or page in my personal account. \$3.50 for an "assumed name" certificate, so I can conduct business (charge account at the printer, for instance). \$25 filing fee for State of Texas as "non-profit corporation." Application for federal non-profit status is free, and, once granted, saves me \$75 worth of taxes from Texas, taxes I probably wouldn't pay anyway. By this I mean none of us pays sales taxes or royalty fees, although by the letter of the law, we all owe them.

And a non-profit organization, whether incorporated or not, pays lower postage.

The central benefit is this: there will be money there to pay off debts if I fold (about \$200 in the account now). I pay in \$10-25/month to ensure it breaks even, but otherwise, the zeen's debts and assets are unconnected to mine. Oh, sure, I could rob my readers again—but if I'm a halfway-

conscientious person, it's gonna be difficult to explain how after all these precautions.

You see, I'm a credit compulsive. I'm going through hell financially precisely *because* I spent, not only the sub fees, but also every "cash advance" I was allowed to take.

Maybe instead of *professional*, *Perelandra* is a *semi-pro* zeen?

[Sounds good to me. Let us know how it all turns out in a few months.]

[This sort of arrangement sounds ideal for something like *Diplomacy World*—they'd save enough on postage costs alone to make it worthwhile. Is *DW* non-profit, Larry? (Yes, I know it always eats tons of money....)]

(BILL SALVATORE) The day I got *HOL* #11/*Retal* #111, I also got *Postal Warrior* V1#1 and *Gaming Universal* #3. So it happens *GU* 3 had an article by WEJ Hinton telling his side of the *LOV* story. I had been thinking that no one had received a turn in five years or so, but evidently it has been run "on the quiet." So, to Elmer's being the "senior professional game-master," I infer that his claim to this title is based on having been publishing *Kaissa* before Rick Loomis started selling game-turns as *Flying Buffalo*. It's not clear who first actually started making a living out of GMing, Rick or Elmer, but it's clear that since Starweb started in the mid-70s, FBInc has been a full-fledged small business, and probably the first one in the field. From Elmer's description, his operation still isn't one. *GU* 3 still lists Bob McLain as editor (and it's abominably proofread, too!). For an overview of the PFP field, I refer you to *GU* 2, devoted to a "PBM Primer."

The Karma League, as I remember, was a group of English dippers who subscribed to an agreement to gang up in all games on any player who stabbed any KL member in any game. I assume that it was out of habit that you misquoted my mention of the title of *The Gamers' Zeen* as *The Gamer's Zeen*, because on the last page of *HOL* 11 you typed it almost correctly—anyway, I just want Earl to know that I wasn't the one who committed the barbarism of using that spelling (misspellings should be obscene, but not absurd!), so if you don't trade with him (evidently you don't because you didn't read "The Nastiest Rating System" Article (I'm amazed that you don't because he's so long established (there! so much for your *double* parens))), please send him either a copy of the page(s) of *HOL* which this sentence

is on, if you print it, or this sheet of paper, if you don't print this sentence (how's that for some confusing self-reference?). Make a note, and I'll send you a copy of the "Nastiest Rating System" article.

[What's confusing about what?]

(ROBERT SACKS) The Diplomatic Congress of Baltimore, 1987, will be conducted as part of Origins 87, which will be held July 2-5, 1987 at the Baltimore Convention Center, the Baltimore Hyatt Regency, and the Days Inn Inner Harbor. We have scheduled the following events:

Duplicate PAX BRITANNICA, Fr 9 am-4 pm, Boardman & Sacks, \$1

SKINNY DIP (Diplomacy variant), Fr 7-11 pm, Davis (proceeds to NAVB), \$1

DIPLOMACY, Sa & Su 9 am-4 pm, Sacks & Boardman, in the Days Inn, \$2

Diplomatic Gaming Seminar, Sa 7-9 pm, free

Diplomacy Hobby Meeting, Sa 9-11 pm, free

There will be many other diplomatic game events, including a cross between Diplomacy and Cosmic Encounters which will be scheduled in the same room and time as Skinny Dip. Origins will also include the full range of miniatures, fantasy role playing, board games, and computer games, plus the annual GAMA trade show (Dealer's room) and their Charles Roberts and HG Wells awards.

We're running Pax Britannica, Diplomacy, and the Hobby Meeting just as we have in the past. We need hobbyists and game designers for the seminar to discuss new developments. The hobby meeting will decide its own agenda as it has in the past.

For information about Origins, write Atlanticon, POB 15405, Baltimore, MD, 21220. For information about Skinny Dip, write Fred Davis, 3210K Wheaton Way, Ellicott City, MD 21043. For other information about the Diplomatic Congress, write Robert Sacks, 4861 Broadway 5-V, NY, NY, 10034-3139.

A word on proceeds. Some of the proceeds from Skinny Dip will go to the MNC recognized by the NAVB: Fred Hyatt. Some of the proceeds from Pax Britannica and Diplomacy will go to the Novice Project recognized by the NYGB: *Masters of Deceit*, and the MNC recognized by the NYGB.

Now how did Gaughan hear that I was upset with him, especially since I obviously wasn't. His latest remark suggests that his attacks are part of a vendetta on his part; this is unfortunate, but

understandable.

Incidentally, American typewriters can produce a passable £ sign by overstriking an "f" and a capital "L".

["Vendetta." What an overused word. Colorful, though.]

Costs

(WALLACE NICOLL) I'm jealous of you and Geryk with your Apple Macs and laser printers...I'd need £7,500+ to get that over here, plus the software. How are the prices in the US?

[Let's see...hardware (Mac Plus, 20MB hard disk, modem, printer) goes for about \$2,400 if you can get a good deal, software another \$1,000 or so (I've spent about \$600 on useful stuff: graphics, page layout, MacWrite, etc. About that much again on programming languages and games.). A bare bones system would run you about \$2500. Of course, Bruce and I don't own our Laserwriters—I do my printing at a local print shop that has a printer for rent (40¢ a page—they usually charge \$1—who says diplomacy isn't useful?), and Bruce does his printing at school. Sure is nice, isn't it?]

(STEPHEN DORNEMAN) Update on my own costs and circulation figures. Although I was exaggerating somewhat when I said it costs almost as much to print 20 issues as it does to print 100, that figure (100 issues) is the minimum for any significant drop in the per copy price for photocopies. For pseudo-offset copies (a higher-quality Xerox copy process), 100 is the minimum order they'll do, and the same for photo-offset itself (where you need 200, or in some places 500, copies before the price starts to get reasonable). However, with issue #2 of *Penguin Dip* my circulation is already up to 51 paid subscribers, and I'm hopeful of hitting 100+ subscribers before too long.

[Pretty impressive. How big was your initial mailing?]

(KEN PEEL) *Politesse* costs 39¢ per issue/month. Ever since I took over at *Politesse*, the zeen's cost has never been more than a few cents over mailing cost. Why? Because I get free photocopying at work. It just happens to be one of my few perks (well, besides free long distance

calls after 5:00 pm and occasional foreign junkets, that is). The "old" *Politesse*, when Ed Wrobel was in charge, died on the double-edged sword of cost overruns and fall-out from feuding (run away, run away...). Ed started *Politesse* in the fall of 1982 as a one-page flyer reporting on the results of the most recent FTF Dip game and announcing the next such game. At first, the distribution was less than two dozen and Ed ran the thing off at work, and asked people to pay him whatever they thought it was worth. In fact, Ed gave free subs to anyone who wrote him enclosing a 3" x 5" piece of paper with the words "*Politesse* is really neat and keen!" By the time I subbed in 1983, *Politesse* had become a full sized, if still non-traditional zeen (in the postal sense). But with Ed at his peak in postal involvement and up to his best writing standards, nearly half of the sub list was made up of out-of-the-area postal dipsters. For a year, the zeen's split personality grew. Foolishly, I convinced Ed to accept a subzeen of mine running a postal game of World Diplomacy. Ed also added the international subzeen *Banhoff Zoo*.

Also, at this time, *Politesse* was pushing (and occasionally exceeding) the 2-oz. limit, all the time being offset printed! Also, the sub policy remained unchanged. I doubt that many of the 100-strong sub list volunteered to pay more than 50¢ for a zeen that cost \$1.10 or more just to print. That means losing about \$100 a month. Then at the end of 1984, the thing crashed. No need to go into the other reason, for the cost reason was enough on its own. Through lack of planning or whatever, *Politesse* had reached a point where Ed found it much easier to fold the zeen (with the sub rates so low) than to keep it going.

So the best thing to do is to be aware that zeens are changing, breathing things. Keep them flexible, and try to adapt your policies and sub rates to the changes that the zeen is undergoing. Is the zeen getting too big to afford? Does that mean that sub rates are too low, or that there are things that ought to be cut? Or, perhaps, should you consider looking for a schmuck like me (I could have run it off for Ed if he had asked), or go to a cheaper, non-photocopying reproduction method?

Voice of Doom is a good example. It started out xerox, but quickly grew to the point that Bruce had to make the decision whether to restrain its growth or go ditto. Ditto it was, and *VOD* continued to grow to the massive presence it became. But one can put out a high class, high quality zeen at a modest size too. Look at

Perelandra (perhaps not the best example, as it, too, folded for a time due to financial constraints). It never goes over an ounce, keeps a fairly small sub list, and yet is one of the towering zeens in the hobby in terms of writing quality, innovative games, and impressive layout.

(BILL SALVATORE) I'm sure Les Casey meant that his zeen runs to two ounces. I'm sorry to hear that Stephen Dorneman is looking to get 300 subbers—he's likely to be disappointed, and he *does* seem like such a nice boy (how's that for weird?).

[Do you mean Dorneman, Casey, or you?]

(PETE GAUGHAN) The *best* deal I can get is 5¢ per side; the best quality for a reasonable price is 7.2¢ per side (8¢ minus student discount; prices based on 50+ copies). I prefer open-page printing with lots of borders and headlines, so quality is important. I'll have a comment under "Why?" about circulation, but I can echo the slow-grow comments from you and her. *Pere* was at 20 quickly, but has never reached 50.

["Her"? Her who?

[You keep a pretty tight rein on gamestarts, don't you? More games would yield more subbers—but games aren't really your primary objective.]

Dipcon

(STEPHEN DORNEMAN) \$100 to organize a Dipcon seems awfully cheap to me, but never having been to one, I'm not sure what attendees are getting in the way of planning and logistics from the committee. SF cons tend to be far more expensive (we're talking thousands of dollars here) to organize, but I think I'm comparing apples to oranges here. Still, if \$100 is all it takes to put on a Dipcon...Maybe I'll put in a bid to host one!

[Sure, put in a bid for "PengoCon" next year! Logistics? Planning? Usually little more than making sure there's a room to play in on a particular weekend, and Dipcon's usually associated with a host con which is already in existence—which helps cut down on the need for planning and other nasty things.]

(RUSS RUSNAK) I'm having a hard time

believing all the talk about a Dipcon in London. The whole idea of Dipcon has been for people in the American (I guess you could include the Canadians as well) hobby to get to know each other. One of the things that has made this possible was the fact that the thing was reasonably affordable to most of us and simply required a long weekend. London would never meet either of those requirements. London would do well for an English tournament of sorts, but let's keep a tournament for the North American hobby where it is relatively accessible to the North American members of the hobby.

[North America has plenty of major tournaments—Origins, Atlanticon, Pacificon, MaryCon, MadCon, Byrnecon, Pudgecon...so many that Dipcon seems lost in the shuffle at times. Sending Dipcon to Britain for a year may help stir up some renewed interest in it.]

(PETE GAUGHAN) My article on Dipcon is done and on to LP. Here's one more vote for *not* replacing Dipcon with something in Europe.

[Well, how about a hint at what's in it? Some of us don't get *DW*, you know.]

(BILL SALVATORE) Making (not merely allowing, by inadvertence, but actually deliberately going out of the way to *make*) the dates for Dipcon conflict with those of Marycon is sheer, perverse madness. It makes every intentional weirdness I have been able to twist out of my evidently plebian brain pale into mere uninspired eccentricity.

[Actually, I think Dipcon coincides with Marycon out of carelessness more than anything else. The Madlads strength is entertainment, not organization.]

(DAVE MCCRUMB) Holding a Dipcon outside of the United States is ridiculous. I think that this is a North American tournament, and should stay as such. I am all for having a WorldCon that rotates to different places. I would probably even attend a few, as long as I knew the language.

[So holding a Dipcon in as radical a place as Canada is ridiculous? While Dipcon originated in the US, what's the fundamental reason that it has to *stay* there?

[And what's the big deal about Dipcon anyway? Can you name the last three tournament

winners off the top of your head? A tournament's a tournament...what difference does it make what it's called?]

(JOHN CARUSO) I've read Fred Davis' innovative ideas about "Worldcon." I think Fred's moving in the right direction. But why only every other year? How about a "Worldcon" every year alternating between UK, Europe, NA, and Australia? How about kicking Fred's idea around in *HOL*?

[Sure, I love to kick Fred around.]

Reprint from *Bushwacker*, February 1987, page 5

WITHER DIPCON?

A proposal has been made by the British hobby to put in a bid for the 1988 Dipcon, to be held in England either at ManorCon in July, or MidCon in November. These are the two big British Diplomacy Cons, both centrally held in or near Birmingham. In the event the bid was successful, the event would be called "World DipCon."

I am all in favor of a "WorldCon" Diplomacy event. However, I do not feel that it should appropriate the "DipCon" title. "DipCon," *per se*, is North America's top Diplomacy event. There is no way that any but a handful of American hobbyists could make it over to England for a tournament. (Anyone wishing to do so can make arrangements *now* to be in Birmingham in summer or November for ManorCon or MidCon.) The DipCon Society Charter provides that the Con will rotate among the four geographic areas of North America in such a way as to provide an opportunity at least once every four years for it to be near most Postal players. Barring a complete absence of other bids, there is no provision for removing it from this continent.

Should the "DipCon" title be removed to Britain in 1988, there would still have to be a premiere North American Tournament held somewhere for the benefit of those who couldn't afford to travel overseas.

I would like to make a different suggestion. Let's have a "WorldCon," by all means, just as the Science Fiction hobby has a World SF Con, which goes from continent to continent. Let this start with a "WorldCon" in England in 1988. The July date would be better, despite higher air fares, since that's the only time many of our people could attend. Also, the weather in November can be pretty miserable. Let's make WorldCon a bien-

nial event, rather than annual. It could be hosted by North America in 1990, Germany or Holland in 1992, etc. On that basis, there might be enough people flying together to get group reductions on the air fares. The alternate year scenario would enable us to save up our money and vacation time for the trips, and for the hosts to have enough time to put on a big event, together with some sightseeing trips on the side.

When in Britain, WorldCon could be held at ManorCon. When in America, it would be part of DipCon. Elsewhere, it could be part of EuroCon, or even AussieCon. With this plan, no current Cons get "taken over" by others, so there are no hard feelings. Every other year, we would have a real World Championship, and the winner could keep his title for two years.

[With nobody else allowed to get Dipcon, why should Dipcon have first rights to World Dipcon, ahead of a major convention like Origins? Why should the selfishness of the American Dipcon be rewarded with an automatic World Dipcon linkage?

[The primary feature of Dipcon is that it moves around, and there's no reason but tradition to keep it locked inside the US. If Dipcon happens to be out of the country for a year, then US dippers can go to any of half a dozen other cons. Just let word get out, "Hey, we're all going to Marycon/Atlanticon/Origins/whatever this year, why not join us?" I doubt that the current, complacent Dipcon would really be missed that greatly. After all, 75% of the country can't make it every year anyway.

[Is titling the article "Wither Dipcon" instead of "Whither Dipcon" a Freudian slip?]

(SIMON BILLENNESS) I've had quite a good response to my "World Dipcon" flyer. What is interesting is that everyone seems to share the same opinions! Reading through my mail recently, I've found Americans' reactions to the "World Dipcon" proposal to be threefold:

1. *Dipcon is North American.* With the exception of yourself and Bruce Linsey, Americans are adamant that Dipcon is a North American tournament only. This feeling is especially strong in Texas (strange, that...), though it is also the majority in the rest of the country. This would seem to rule out holding a Dipcon in Britain.

2. *Americans want a Worldcon.* Although Americans view Dipcon as their tournament, the idea of a separate Worldcon rotating from country to country is very popular.

3. *Americans prefer Manorcon.* In my "World Dipcon" flyer, I asked Americans which British convention would be best for the event. The choice was Manorcon, which is held in July, or Midcon, which is held in November. Of those who expressed a preference, everyone went for Manorcon, since July is the best vacation time.

Based on this feedback, I'd like to suggest an alternative proposal. The British bid for Dipcon 88 can be dropped, and instead Manorcon can host the first "Diplomacy Worldcon." My preference is for Fred Davis' suggestion in the last *Bushwacker* of a biennial convention. I'd like to see it rotate every two years between Britain, North America, and continental Europe. In Britain, it would be held in conjunction with Manorcon, in North America with Dipcon, and on the continent with Eurocon. So long as "Diplomacy Worldcon" is held with another convention like Manorcon or Dipcon, we can be sure of a good initial domestic turnout, plus a few foreigners who can afford to jet-set over.

Again I'd be interested in receiving feedback on this idea. I'd like to gradually compile a "Diplomacy Worldcon Charter," modelled largely on the Dipcon Charter, to be voted on at the first "Diplomacy Worldcon" and ratified at the next one. Suggestions, anyone?

[A rotation between Britain, North America and Europe isn't really much of a "world," is it? What about Australia, South America, any anywhere else that Dip may be played. I think a set rotation for any World Dipcon would be a mistake, just as the set rotation for Dipcon has its anti-competitive points. Send the con where it'll get the best reception, and leave it at that. I think it's a mistake to assume that a con will end up stuck in any particular location as a result.

[Yes, July would be the best time for Americans to head over to Britain, but that really shouldn't be a factor. Why cater to a handful of US dippers (who might make the trip under any circumstances) when there will be many more Europeans at the con? Arrangements should be made that are optimal for the British and European contingents. If World Dipcon is ever held on this continent, then we'll worry more about our vacation times and whatnot.]

(MARK BERTCH) I am personally opposed to the idea of holding Dipcon in England in 1988.

Dipcon is supposed to be a way where the American hobby can get together, to meet and to select a tournament champion. To do this, it

needs to be accessible. The reason that Dipcon rotates is to insure its accessibility. England would be an extremely inaccessible location. Let's not kid ourselves. No more than a handful of people from North America could swing such a trip. A lot of people go to Dipcon by car because that's what makes the trip affordable. The passport alone may cost more than such a drive if you've got several people in the car. I think the average dippy player can accept that one year it's on the east coast and another it's on the west coast, but the idea that it's going so far away from *everybody* is a little hard to take. The British have their own National Tournament, and let's keep ours.

For the truth of the matter is there are two separate tournament hobbies. There is some degree of internationalism in the postal hobby, but it is rare for someone to cross the Atlantic to attend a con, and let's not pretend it's otherwise. This lack of contact doesn't arise from the failure to have dipcons in Europe. It arises from the extreme difficulty of crossing the Atlantic. Making Dipcon in Europe in 1988 isn't going to make it cheaper. Very few dippers even cross the country, which is much easier and much cheaper.

This is especially true for ManorCon, which is held in July. That's when rates are at their highest, and bargain fares are often unavailable. It's held in Birmingham, one of the most depressing cities in England.

MidCon, if anything, is even less appealing. It's generally held in early November, which pretty much eliminates high school and college students right there. Again Birmingham, and this time in a dreary month. Because it's held at a hotel, rates are higher. Last year it was £18, about \$27 per person per night, assuming you were willing to share a room (higher for a single). And there's a \$9 registration fee.

Please keep in mind that one of the main draws for Dipcon is that you get to see some of your friends in person. With so few North Americans likely to go, that factor will largely disappear, making Dipcon even less appealing. And keep in mind also that Dipcon 88 will choose a location for Dipcon 89. Is that something we want left to people (Britishers) who have virtually no stake in the outcome, because virtually none of them will even consider attending an American Dipcon?

[Britishers would also have fewer vested interests in assigning the con for the following year, unless they decided to keep it (which I consider unlikely). With that being the case, there may ac-

tually be some competition for the following Dipcon, for a change.]

(ROBERT SACKS) The materials for the NYGB/Atlanticon 1986 Dipcon bid were sent to Gaughan before I went to Hong Kong. When I returned, I read in several zeens that the bid had been received. I therefore concentrated in attempting to get Atlanticon to send a confirming/supporting letter, but they were too busy negotiating with the convention center and adjacent hotels, and at the time they had nothing to add to the bid (which they had seen).

It should be apparent that the Dipcon administrative committee has a conflict of interest if it can run Dipcon and block bids from groups who wish to run Dipcon without interference by the administrative committee. The administrative committee has, and should have, neither power, except by usurpation. The materials for the NYGB bid should have been presented to the Society for an honest vote, not excluded as part of a vendetta or power play. The selection of the NYGB would have resulted in a Dipcon this year that did not suddenly change dates, held in conjunction with the principal wargaming convention of the year, with a schedule even more extensive than that of the Diplomatic Congress. And having obtained the Dipcon (or even lost in a fair vote), the NYGB and Atlanticon would not have decided to start the Diplomatic Congress.

As to Billeness' two British Dipcon alternatives, both should be presented to the Society for an honest vote. I learned to speak in England. I've been there twice on business in the last three and a half years. I'm going there this summer for the World Science Fiction Convention. And I'm not going to attend Dipcon there.

Did the Society authorize the committee to not distribute the funds? It should be apparent that the Dipcon administrative committee has a conflict of interest if it can run Dipcon and vote to distribute the funds to the group that runs Dipcon.

The NYGB is not local to the Philadelphia and Baltimore areas where it has conducted diplomacy tournaments. The first time we ran the tournament it wasn't significantly harder. (Of course, it helps to know what you are doing: I came into postal diplomacy based on my performance as a diplomacy tournament master in the 70s; I had seen many tournaments misrun; having rescued a number of events at the previous Origins, I had the confidence of the convention management; I had a tournament scoring system based on a ratings system I designed during the ratings controversies of the

70s; I had a tournament adjudication system based on tournament bridge.)

[The society authorized the committee to spend the money as it saw fit. The committee decided that this was a good year to invest in maintaining itself. I know no more.]

[Robert, if you were really serious about getting a Dipcon bid for this year you should have arranged to have someone make a verbal presentation to the society for you. I would have been happy to do so, had I known. That's the way it's been done for several years now, at least. Simply submitting a bid to the committee chairman (who doesn't have the power to decide the matter anyway) is a risky proposition at best.]

[Sure, on paper Origins has Madcon beat easily, but Madcon has the advantage of being "different." Hopefully both cons will turn out just fine.]

Diptax

(JEFF ZARSE) Diptax sounds like a very silly idea. The way I understand it, we pay a "tax" to get a Boardman Number—is that right? If this goes through, there will be renegade Dip games with bootlegged BNs. I volunteer myself to be the first ZNC (Zarse Number Custodian) if we ever need it.

[I don't see any pressing danger of the Diptax becoming a mandatory thing. All recent BNCs have been violently opposed to it, so its adoption in relation to the BNs is unlikely.]

[But if you want to be ZNC anyway, go right ahead! We can all use a good laugh.]

(SIMON BILLENNESS) I thought Alan Stewart's idea of a bloated committee structure to administer Diptax centrally was just a piss-take. It could not be serious! Besides, I feel he's wrong in assuming that we're still living in the "Great (sic) American Feud Era." Serious, extensive feuding has fortunately died out. I'd suggest that we are now in a time of North American hobby renaissance, when public attention has shifted to more constructive topics like raising money for hobby services, organizing a Diplomacy Worldcon, and recruiting more new players.

It was quite eye-opening to discover exactly which services Robert Sacks intends to fund. He won't fund the Boardman Number Custodian, but he intends to give money to the Orphans Game

Project (which is defunct—games are now rehoused by the US Orphans Service), *Known Game Openings* (run by Robert Sacks), *Known Game Openings Zine Directory* (run by Robert Sacks), the "MNC under the covenant" (soon to be Robert Sacks), and finally something useful: *Masters of Deceit*. What a waste of money—particularly Robert Sacks' make-believe MNC, which has no hobby support and which only assigned two numbers last year, neither of which is being used! Obviously Robert Sacks' fund-raising does not fund a broad selection of hobby services. At the moment, the main recipient appears to be Robert Sacks.

[And what's wrong with that? The funds seem to be spent in a responsible enough manner. OGP is *not* defunct, as it's been more or less merged into US Orphan service. *KGO Zeen Directory* will be merged into the *Zeen Register* when Ken takes that over. Julie will be the new MNC. Robert's not in it for the money, there just haven't been any volunteers for the jobs lately.]

(JOHN CARUSO) PDORA: Everything is going without a hitch, more or less. A screwup by me with the due date caused the omission from the booklet of a valuable contribution from Mark Berch. Other than that, dozens of people have participated thus far, from those who have donated items to those bidding on the items, and those generous publishers who either plugged the auction or ran the booklet in their zeens. I wish to take this time to thank everyone very much for making the auction a success once again.

[So what was the final haul? And did Peter Sullivan win anything?]

(ROBERT SACKS) *Masters of Deceit* is a publication which can be sold at a reasonable cost. \$1 barely covers the postage, and I do not believe it comes close to the production costs. After they start receiving NYGB funds, I hope they will be able to lower the price, but I suspect the money won't even make a dent in the existing deficit. Just because Arnawoodian and/or Olsen are subsidizing the deficit doesn't mean the rest of us shouldn't, and since Arnawoodian sits on the PDORA allocation committee, there won't be any funds for *Masters of Deceit* from PDORA; other people should send donations if they want to encourage it.

[And just wait until you see the next edition—laser pretty! And at only 40¢ a page for the masters....]

Filing Systems

(PETE GAUGHAN) My filing system reflects the fact that I'm a pack rat. The green 3x5s are *Pere* subscribers or ex-subscribers (subscribers filed separately). The white 3x5s are people I'm in games with, or GMs, or publishers, who haven't subbed to *Pere*. Then I have a "banker's box" for zeens that I save (about one-third of what I receive), game files, and artwork.

[So what do you keep and what do you toss? I used to use 4x6 cards, myself.]

Finding New Subbers

(KEN PEEL) Well, the gamestore flyer idea seems to be on the move. As of this typing, 10 people are in the process of placing the flyer. They are: me (Washington D.C.), Simon Billenness (Staten Island), Stephen Dorneman (Boston), Bruce Linsey (Pittsfield—the smallest city, but the biggest hit), Mark Frueh (St. Louis), Bob Olsen (Wichita), Fred Davis (Baltimore), Mike Mazzer (West Los Angeles), Andy Cruickshank (Honolulu), and Mark Stegeman (Chapel Hill). Of these people, Bruce, Simon, Fred, and Andy volunteered, Stephen I simply foisted the thing on, and the rest are folks that I just happen to have talked to on the phone over the past three weeks. All together, over 3000 copies of the flyer have been run off, the vast majority of which representing one massive 2000-flyer job for Bruce. It seems that Bruce managed to talk the one gamestore that carries Diplomacy in Pittsfield to enclose the flyer with their next catalogue mailing, which goes out to about 2000 people.

I assume that the most successful method of placing the flyer will continue to be through direct requests. For instance, the January issue of *HOL* contained a long letter from me about the flyer with an enclosure (you did remember the enclosure, eh, Dick?). But that effort produced no volunteers from this august assembly. But I would guess that virtually all of those receiving *HOL* would agree to give it a go (and would probably even do so) if I happened to be talking to them and asked, or if the request was put in a personal letter. The wonderful thing about the gamestore

flyer is that it takes very little time, and the rewards of a job well done are immense. Why, even you could find your name listed in the next *HOL*.

Moving to Caruso's letter, if there is a point I guess I missed it. Both cons and gamestores are good locations for recruitment—in fact, I would venture to say that these are probably the only two places where one can gain direct contact with large numbers of actual warm game-playing bodies. The other possible audiences are either more diffuse or more distant, such as through ads (or preferably articles) in gaming magazines, the resurrected gamebox flyer, and word of mouth.

So what's Caruso's beef about gamestores? That the majority of the people there are essentially FTFers? What is so awfully horrid about FTF players as a likely pool for PBM dipsters? I wonder if it is .01% or .001% of postal Dip players that happen to leap cleanly from the forehead of NonGaming Existence to postal players that did not pass GO, did not collect \$200, and did not ever play Diplomacy FTF prior to their first postal experience. (Actually, I could say that did not ever play any game FTF that might have required their entrance into a better gamestore.)

None of my comments, however, are meant to detract from Caruso's *Diplomacy Introductory Publication (DIP)*. I saw *DIP* (when he was doing it a few years ago) as the best product yet for handing out at cons. It was quick and snappy, and answered the basic questions of what postal Dip is, and how to get involved. But I see *DIP* and the gamestore flyer as essentially different things for different audiences. At cons, one finds an enthusiastic sampling of gamers who are sufficiently committed to the hobby to devote an entire weekend and some considerable amount of money to OD on the games of their choice. For this reason, I think that distribution of a more extensive publication like *DIP* or the novice packages makes a lot of sense. And so much the better if passed out by real, breathing postal dipsters just hitting the peak of their latest caffeine infusion.

But what may be most efficient for cons may not be most efficient for gamestores. The idea of direct promotion through gamestores has only begun to get off the ground and already 3000 copies have been produced—at virtually no cost. How much would it have cost to run off 3000 copies of *DIP*, *Masters of Deceit*, or *Supernova*? All the gamestore flyer attempts to be is a promotional sizzle. It is up to the potential novice to bite, and reach out for the substance—that being one or both of the novice packages (plus *Zine*

Register) listed on the flyer. The flyer requires that they drop \$1 in the mail to Bruce or Woody, which represents at least a minimum of commitment of money and the basic ability to affix postage to envelope.

Finally, I am not surprised that Caruso has little success with unprompted volunteers for placing *DIP* in gamestores. Frankly, I never remember you asking. But even my modest attempt in a similar vein with the gamestore flyer has not produced much more. But that does not mean that good participation from Dipdom is unobtainable. The one thing I learned from recruiting volunteers in political campaigns is that you cannot expect the dead to raise themselves. It takes someone to go out and raise them. I see nothing wrong with the need to effectively promote an effort prior to widespread participation. Any help you may wish to be, John, is gratefully accepted.

(JOHN CARUSO) I'd rather not take Alan Stewart to task, but *MOD*'s first issue didn't come out until Spring, 1985! I think his comments in the last *HOLs* were mistaken, chronologically speaking.

Maybe I contacted the *wrong people* about help in putting the *Diplomacy Introductory Publication* in game stores. But I did have numerous volunteers handing it out for me at various cons across the country.

While I agree that circulating *DIP*, or any flyer such as Peel's, certainly can help recruit newcomers, I neither think it's the best way nor the most cost effective way of recruiting.

I might be surprised at the number of *Politesse* postal people (the Olsens, Langleys, and Byrnes always do surprise me), but I am curious as to how many local MD-VA people who do get *Politesse* get only *Politesse*, and how many other get just one or two other zeens. Maybe Ken will survey his readers and get back to us in a couple of months. (This would represent his flyer idea in miniature, since WARTHOG has been recruiting locally for more than a year.)

This service Ken is starting could, someday, seek hobby funding. I don't know about anyone else, but I personally don't consider \$200 expenses in order to recruit 20 new people as cost effective. I'd rather give away \$5 worth of my zeen to the guy next door. I have a better chance of recruiting him. Or placing an ad or three into different hobby type publications such as *Games*, *The General*, *Guns & Ammo*, *Playboy*....

[Just a quick glance at the latest *Politesse*

mailing list tells me that roughly half of the Poli-subbers are locals with little other affiliation with Greater Dipdom. Most of the non-locals don't participate in the zeen (some are DC/Balto locals who've temporarily flown the coop).]

(BRUCE LINSEY) John Caruso may have a good point about the gamestore flyers. I recently posted one of Ken's flyers in the lone Pittsfield game outlet. The flyer directs people to both *Supernova* and *Masters of Deceit*. Do you know, I've yet to draw a single inquiry from that flyer! However, my understanding is that a similar flyer in the DC area stores has netted lots of response for Ken, so maybe we just need to keep plugging away. I checked into the price of putting an ad for *Supernova/MOD* into *Games* magazine, but it turns out we're talking hundreds of bucks, so I dropped the idea.

[That certainly seems sensible. The only way for Dipdom to get into something like *Games* magazine would be for free—if they were interested in doing an article on us.

[You *still* haven't heard anything?]

(PETE GAUGHAN) Every sample requested goes out with a one-page form letter introducing the zeen, and personal hello and update on the back of that. With this system and *no* publicity other than the zeen yellow-page listings, about half of those who got samples subscribed.

Well, the March issue of *Pere* will go out to nearly 100 people who haven't seen it before, unsolicited. I'll let you know what percentage responds. (I'm sure it will be less than average because of the nature of my zeen.)

We don't have a game shop in North Texas. A comic/SF chain carries games as a sideline (mostly fantasy), and I have a flyer on their "Battle Board." No response in the first month. Should I pass names and addresses on to you?

[Sure, if you get any. I'll print 'em up, and they'll be in the mainstream in no time.

[From my experience, unsolicited samples are an ineffective way to pick up new subbers. My response rate is under 20%, while those people that write requesting a sample end up subbing/playing over 50% of the time. I'll be interested to hear how you do.]

(PETER SULLIVAN) I'm surprised to hear you say that US zeens have no difficulty filling Diplomacy games. I suppose the US hobby has

too many Indians and not enough Chiefs (from the games point of view), whereas it's the other way round here. Maybe I should start up an American zeen instead of running a British one.

[Quite a few new zeens start about four games or so before sensibly putting on the brakes. Those games last for a couple of years, and few new games are started in the meantime. I can't think of any zeens except *Retal* and *Graustark* that run more than about six games and have openings on a regular basis. Of course, I've filled about thirteen games in the last year or so...and counting.]

(BILL SALVATORE) Phone numbers should never be published. Anyone who wants to get calls about a game can send phone number and calling hours in the first letter to an opponent. I can't understand why you hadn't received a hobby flyer as of the publication of *HOL* 11—I got one in *Politesse* 46.

Maybe Dorneman can handle his 300 subbers if he can adjudicate games in Larzelere's painfully accurate yet amazingly lightning-like fashion. I wonder if ML's half-hour includes typing the results? I loved Becker's comments about the NY-USPS. I hope Sacks doesn't come down on me too hard for perhaps using linguistics technical terms somewhat incorrectly—it's just a hobby for me. I'm a mathematician by training, a statistician by job title, and a scientific programmer by function.

(ANDY LISCHETT) On finding new subbers, perhaps flyers can be posted on college bulletin boards in addition to game stores. Maybe a lower percentage of those who see the flyer at a college will be interested, but it's a lower percentage of a much larger number. I (for one) regularly come within posting distance of four or five large schools, while I know of only one game store in Chicago (there may be more, but I don't know them).

The sample flyer provided by Jim Burgess is good, but too professional and commercial looking (at least for colleges, maybe not game stores). I'd get rid of the line at the bottom saying, "Published in the US by The Avalon Hill Game Company," because it leaves the impression that a business (TAHGC) is involved with the flyer, and I'd remove the plugs for *Masters of Deceit* and *Supernova*. They may be worth \$1.00 each, but I (and others) am suspicious of unknown people who ask for money through the mail. Instead, I'd

stress the local connection, and maybe suggest sending a SASE for a list of known game openings.

If I were to go around putting up flyers, I'd make them with a pocket and then stuff that pocket with copies of my zeen. I think people would be more interested if a sample was right there.

I said, "if I put up flyers" because I'm not currently looking for a bunch of new subscribers. However, I might ask some of my favorite publishers if they would like me to push their zeens.

(SIMON BILLENNESS) I'm pleased to see that John Caruso and Alan Stewart had both thought of advertising the hobby in gameshops a year or so before. It is not a new idea. I thought of it independently in Britain, and later I sold the idea to Ken Peel when he expressed interest in hobby recruitment.

The debate over which methods are best for attracting novices is fascinating. I realize I'm generalizing a great deal here, but for the sake of argument, there seem to be four main methods of hobby recruitment. In order of importance:

1. *Personal*. The best method of recruitment is simply friends introducing friends to the hobby. I reckon this brings in people who are more likely to stick around, and it probably attracts more people than the other methods. However, I feel it doesn't bring in enough new recruits to keep the hobby growing. Hence, you need the more "artificial" methods below, too.

2. *Gamebox flyer*. My feeling is that the British hobby's strong, steady growth over the last few years has been mainly due to the constant presences of a recruitment flyer in the Diplomacy gamebox. It is direct and requires minimal effort once established. Fortunately, due to the hard work of Larry Peery and Ken Peel (with a little prodding from me), the American gamebox flyer has been reestablished. Now that has been achieved, attention should be paid to other methods.

3. *Magazine plugs*. The hobby is receiving some excellent plugs in pro-magazines, most notably *The General*. A recent mention of the Zine Bank there gained me over 25 requests! However, again, I feel this area is pretty well-covered already.

4. *Gameshop and convention flyers*. Since the above three methods are already widely used, Ken Peel and I have been working on developing the possibilities of flyers in gameshops and left lying around at gaming and SF conventions. Ken Peel's current scheme is modelled partly on the

operation I ran for over a year in Britain before I moved to America. I distributed probably two thousand flyers and received about two hundred requests and subscriptions for *20 Years On*, then the British equivalent of the *Zeen Register*.

This is probably not as productive an area as the above three, but I reckon it has great potential once we discover which gameshops and conventions generate the best returns. It's also a great way of involving hobby people in recruitment at a grassroots level. If anyone would like to leaflet a nearby gameshop or convention, they only have to contact Ken or me for materials and advice.

Could anyone else think of other areas to explore?

[How about a bake sale?

[Really, flyers do seem to be pretty cost effective—largely because they're cheap to mass-produce.]

(ROBERT SACKS) Peel sent me one copy of the hobby flyer, and I picked up another at Boskone, the annual New England Science Fiction Convention.

I distribute *KGO* at conventions, and I have had a small but steady stream of new players over the years. I suspect cheaper zeens have had a better return on my efforts than I have.

GMinG Procedure

(STEPHEN DORNEMAN) In response to Russ Rusnak's query about changing a house-rule while a game is already in progress—I would do this only with a unanimous vote by all the players in all the games in a zeen (unless not changing the rule—say a rule that “deadlines will be three days after receipt of the new issue” would cause the game or zeen to fold).

[Yeah, but who'd have a rule like that to begin with?]

(BRUCE LINSEY) You may have misunderstood me on the business of whether a position should be vulnerable to the persuasive influence of other players, but then again, I probably didn't state it very clearly. I generally do feel this way, but when a position is NMRed, obviously that isn't possible. Thus, there needs to be some uniquely determined manner of generating orders for the units of an NMRing country. The traditional “all units hold” is a legitimate way of doing this.

So are neutral S'01 orders, if everyone knows what those orders will be. So is Berch's WAP proposal. And so are Randolph Smyth's uniquely determined GOs. (In response to your request that I explain how these work, I refer you to *Once Upon a Deadline*, page G-51, which you are welcome to reprint or paraphrase in *HOL*.) I personally wouldn't use Randolph's method—it's far too cumbersome for my taste—but it *does* generate a unique set of general orders for a country.

On the other hand, “normal” general orders do not accomplish this. Thus, the orders for a country could be neither subject to the influence of another player *nor* (in the event of an NMR) uniquely determinable. And this is my objection, which I realize was not well-stated before.

Sorry, but I still disagree with you on Sacks' anonymous standby policy. Yes, the standby could initiate diplomacy if he's so inclined. But what if he doesn't? It is the absolute right of any player to write the standby and make proposals, threats, or whatever, *before* the orders are submitted. This is a fundamental axiom of the structure of the game of Diplomacy. And if the standby doesn't initiate negotiations, Robert Sacks' procedure *absolutely denies the players that right*. And that is why his games are variants—specifically, partially Gunboat.

[After rereading Randolph's article I still can't tell how his are any different from “normal” general orders. While he encourages specific general orders, he doesn't disallow the more vague “attack Austria” kind. They *can* be uniquely determinable, but don't *have* to be.

[In any case, while the orders may or may not be uniquely determinable, the other players have no idea what they will be—unlike the other systems mentioned.

[Tell me, Robert: if a player sends you a negotiation letter to forward to the standby for a country (all you need to do is address it and drop it in the mail), would you forward it?]

(CONRAD VON METZKE) 1901 NMRs—Kevin Tighe quotes a system I used to use, and may yet return to: a Spring [01] NMR causes the player to be dropped, replaced, and the game delayed an issue. To the best of my knowledge, I thought that one up (for my late Canadian xyn, *Saguenay*) as a response to a particularly sloppy game in which two players dropped before the start, leaving the thing hideously skewed. I later concocted the “neutral 1901 orders” scheme to get

around the delays, but I'm gradually becoming convinced that the delay can be worthwhile in terms of letting a truly active player re-balance the game.

One difficulty with these, or any other, systems is that nothing whatsoever can be done to compensate for dropouts who also fail to negotiate. By the time an NMR comes to public notice, the damage has probably been done and rectification may not be possible. If I join a game and hear from only five of the other six, I am certainly not going to make any alliance plans to include the missing person. And if, having worked around this point, I am suddenly confronted with a new (standby) player writing to ask if I'll consider undoing all my negotiations in order to give him a fair break, I'm just not going to do it. I do not negotiate for the purpose of changing my mind whimsically, nor, I suspect, does anyone else.

Some GMs have endeavored to hedge against this, to some extent, by requiring preliminary orders the issue prior to the first season's deadline. If someone does not submit prelims, a standby is called on the spot. Although I endorse the logic behind this idea, I wonder if it really accomplishes anything; the "negotiation" gap may be foreshortened by it, but the gap is still there. I'd be interested in some practical results from people who have had specific experience under the system.

To the point of listing votes, I'm very much with most of the writers you've cited: I don't publish any data except the end result. If a player wishes to publicize his/her individual vote, that's his/her business; there are ways of doing this (*eg* coded press).

I very much like Bob Olsen's point about non-confirmation adding intrigue. It does indeed. Moreover, it adds it in a "neutral" way, *ie* without the GM nudging anything toward a tilt. I can add "intrigue" in a hundred ways, and many of them might even be fun, but most will require some subjective action on my part. This one doesn't.

[I don't think the "negotiation gap" is necessarily the handicap you make it. In fact, it may work out for the best sometimes: the other players have a chance to have their first falling out, and the standby can step in as the much-sought ally. It seems that most such standbys approach the game with a "standby mentality" though, and don't put forth much effort. I usually work my diplomacy around the board position, so the lateness of negotiations isn't any big deal (if things go smoothly).

[I handle the situation by delaying the game and calling a standby, not outright removal of the

NMRing player.

[Secret votes add "intrigue"? My experience has been quite the opposite—usually they're just an annoyance, and lead to a lot of proposals that have no chance of passing. Of course, since I combine my public votes with DIAS, that's significantly different from a non-DIAS situation.

[The other reason I'm going public is that nobody else does it. Except maybe Pete....]

(PETE GAUGHAN) My houserules are the ones I'd like to play under. Proposals and votes are public, one- and two-dot powers don't get standbys, and deadlines are *monthly* (not four or five weeks) so every month I know about which date to expect what.

[I went monthly after five years of pubbing for the same reason: now I can plan things better (and I was having a terrible time remembering when the deadlines were!). I'd sign up for your game, but Don Williams is already signed up—and Olsen's been warning me about him for years now.]

(PETER SULLIVAN) I probably have slightly more dropouts than average in the British hobby, but I don't think the rate is so high to cause problems for my standby procedure (though this is, of course, purely subjective). I agree that delaying the game to insert a new player might make others lose interest a bit—it might even make them lose interest as much as if I were to delay the game to play Winter separately!

[Or if you did both.]

(BOB OLSEN) In answer to Russ Rusnak's question, I think that a change of houserules such as he outlines should require a unanimous vote of the players; that seems to me to be the only fair way, though, as you know, it is very difficult to make any change, since nobody in Dip ever agrees with anybody else on anything.

Oh, here's another "GM Interference" poser for Russ. What about the case where the players vote for a separated winter season, and in publishing the adjustments, the GM announces which players have orders in for the Spring turn? If you want to get really picky, this seems to me somewhat questionable, since this gives the player information on who's not going to NMR.

[If I were to do something like that, it'd be in the form of little notes on the outside of the zeen unless I had orders from all the players. I

wouldn't just put an announcement of who has orders in the game report.]

(JOHN CARUSO) The reasons that I gave up on a standby list are similar to the reasoning that Hugh Christie gave for having standbys. Keeping an active rotating list of players, keeping track of who was called for what position, not favoring one player over another due to the strength or weakness of a position. I, too, used to call a standby for every NMR, whether one center or seventeen. The last game I started, I used no standby list. The last game I am running at the present is an orphan, and I'm using standbys.

Peter Sullivan's standby policy is unique. One must wonder what the players' reactions would be if a game was delayed every other turn because the GM implemented a delay in order to call a standby for an NMR. It could unnecessarily cause problems.

Boardman Numbers for FTF games! Why not? Let's face facts: the chess hobby and TAHGC(AREA) both rate FTF games between sanctioned players. Both also rate mail games between sanctioned players. As Russ Rusnak points out, FTF and PBM are two different animals, yet other games are rated, both FTF and PBM. Why not Diplomacy as well?

Secret/Public Draw Voting: Russ Rusnak uses an example regarding *Rebel's* house rule amendment. Fundamentally, the change in Melinda's HR does not affect the mechanics of the game. It just reflects, presumably, a change in her opinion—to give her players the decision on whether the vote the player made be public or kept private. (It's kept private unless specifically asked for public.) I see nothing wrong with this kind of mid-stream HR change.

However, I have seen other types of HR changes that should not have taken place. Changing from any draw proposals are acceptable to DIAS; changing NVR=No to NVR=Yes; changing dislodged unordered units retreat OTB to retreating allowed; adding a rule that allows general orders to be kept on file; I'm sure that I've seen many, many more, some more critical to the game than others. My point is that new rules should only be for games signed up for by players that knew the rules beforehand. It should only be applied to existing games if *all of the players* approve of the new rule. I know Russ might say—doesn't this hold true for Melinda's rule as well? I suppose it could, even though this rule change is insignificant.

Let me tell you what I would do and what I

suggest any GM should consider doing if faced with a similar problem: hypothetically, I'm the GM (and using Melinda's rule change as an example) who made this simple rule change, and one player objected to it. I would not force this new rule on the existing players unless they all agreed to using it. I would instead revert to utilizing my original rule for the game that this player was in. In this instance, it is not necessary to revert back to the old rule; however, it's better to appease one irate player over a change as opposed to creating a monumental problem or a resignation over this. It's better to have peace than cause hard feelings. The *only time* I'd force a rule change above player opposition would be if the previous rule made a game unratable (irregular). Even then, if *all of the players* agreed to keep the old (irregular) rules, I'd bow to their wishes.

The following are different standby policies pertaining to NMRs: anonymous standbys, neutral S01 orders, general orders, collect call, perpetual orders, WAP (as proposed by Mark Berch in *OUAD*). There was a very good discussion in *KK* a few months ago about WAP, and Mark Berch brought up some very convincing points. Why should one of these so-called policies cause a game to be irregular, while others allow a game to remain regular? WAP and perpetuals are quite similar in that they both reuse a previous turn's orders. Yet games using perpetual orders are regular, and it's being argued that those using WAP should be irregular. Both of these policies, however, deny the player the chance to negotiate the moves. In fact, all of the above policies deny the player negotiations for the turn's movement, except for the collect call list. However, only anonymous standbys have caused games to be declared irregular, while all the other games using any of these other policies have been regular. And now WAP is under debate. So how about we discuss WAP here, in the GM/Publishers discussion forum, its similarities and differences to these other standby policies, as well as people's opinions of all these standby policies.

[Hey, I'm easy. You start? As far as I'm concerned, the only method you mention that I don't like is general orders. My problem there is that the player really has no direct connection to the orders used—he's not really playing the game.

[Why, players would be too tempted to cheat if they could get BNs for ftf games, of course. And who cares enough to keep a record of hundreds of ftf games? An alternative might be a separate, parallel listing of ftf games. If you want the

job, just say so: you can be the CNC. Let's C now, that's MNC, BNC, FNC, NNC, ZNC, CNC....

[I change my HRs all the time, and the only complaint I've ever had was when I *hadn't* changed anything! My HRs are more properly considered "guidelines" though. Most players really don't care about the HRs, as long as they don't change too radically.

[Maintaining a standby list was too much for you, eh? I usually just pick the person on the list in the fewest games, as long as she hasn't been in the game already. That's why I keep picking you all the time, Melinda.]

(ROBERT SACKS) The US Snail: On February 7, I received a letter mailed from Cambridge, MA April 29.

My system is similar to Larzelere's, except I don't capitalize the successful part of the order, and I no longer type onto ditto masters. Calls for draws/concessions, and how people vote on draws/concessions, should be secret. Of course, if the house rules provide otherwise.... In tournaments, players have taken me aside and asked that a proposed early adjudication be denied because they didn't want the settlement proposed by the leader of their alliance—as long as it is an early adjudication, I've honored such requests with an arbitrary "Play it out." (Note that when the six or seven hours allocated for the round are up, I have to adjudicate the game.) This of course increases my reputation for arbitrary high-handed conduct, but that's a minor sacrifice compared to increasing the validity of the results and furthering play.

Caruso referred the game to the BNC because I would not allow him and his buddies to run the sewer through my zeen in the guise of press after I refused to cheat for one player. The BNC rejected that, but invented a complaint against the standby policy without taking any statement or evidence from the GM. When I obtained supporting statements from other GMs, the BNC claimed he hadn't received them and harassed those GMs. When the BNC talks to one side, changes their argument, and hands it down as a ruling before talking to the other side, that's collusion.

Neutral S'01 orders and general orders can't be changed by diplomacy either, unless you convince the player of record to submit orders.

I claim my games have been declared irregular because the BNC so declared them as a special category. This is, of course, a Bill of Attainder, illegal in American practice, but that doesn't bother a BNC who colludes with players to declare

games irregular and harasses GMs. As for changing policies, forget it. I'm not going to adopt an unethical policy under coercion from the BNC, and I'm not going to turn my zeen into the kind of sewer rag that Caruso likes in a vain attempt to gain more players. Most of the postal games I have run have been orphans, picked up in 1901 or 1902 and carried through to completion—until the BNCship has been cleansed of its corruption, I'm not going to pick up any orphans or start any games of Diplomacy. After all, I'm not doing the players in an orphan any good if any game I pick up is automatically irregular.

[On April 2 I received a copy of *Bohemian Rhapsody* postmarked February 2. Granted, it had to come all the way from Norway. Two months is still ridiculous, though.

[Rather than just appearing arbitrarily capricious, why don't you make clear to all players that you will refuse to grant draws in the situation you describe. You'd hear less griping, and perhaps more players will take advantage of the "secret" vote in tournament play.

[While I'm not going to call the BNC corrupt, it certainly seems like he's been asleep at the switch in this case. I've asked about the situation a couple times and have yet to hear a decent explanation from Steve Heinowski. He's certainly been pretty casual about the whole affair.]

Out of Dipdom Experiences

(STEPHEN DORNEMAN) Don Del Grande notes in the latest *Life of Monty* that Don, myself, and Cathy Ozog are all Dip publishers who have had FRP (read, D&D) zeens published in the role playing game Amateur Press Association *Alarums & Excursions*, edited and published by Lee Gold (3965 Alla Road, Los Angeles, CA, 90066, and recommended reading for all fantasy role players. It costs \$1.50 plus postage per issue for non-contributors.). In *Penguin Dip* I've got a number of subscribers who currently play various FRPGs and are just now hearing about the postal Dip hobby.

[I used to read *A&E*, but must have missed your stuff!]

(DAVE MCCRUMB) I got into the hobby my freshman year in college, fall of 1978. I started out with an upperclass roommate who was heavily into drugs and alcohol. He couldn't stand me ei-

ther, so we arranged a three-way switch. I got someone I didn't know (since I only knew two others at Tech, that is not surprising). He had this funny game with little wooden blocks that he pushed around a map of Europe. Since I loved history, and played any new game I could get my hands on, I quietly learned it over a two week period. I then challenged him to a two-player game. He beat me that day, then I thrashed him the next.

He introduced me to pbm by letting me be a standby in a game he was running (with the permission of all the other players, of course). I discovered I loved pbm. When we no longer occupied the same room, he let me start a game. I won that one, and tied the next. I next got into variants, and that is where I get most of my fun now.

I started running games myself in 1980. By '83, I had four games going by newsletter. To make it easier on me and the players in more than one game, I combined them and called it *The Appalachian General*. Since then, I have discovered that I enjoy publishing better than playing. However, I keep my hand in with a couple of gamestarts every two or three years.

[So who was your roomie, anybody we'd know? And was he in the "mainstream" of Dipdom, or off in a side stream. I seem to recall that *TAG* had been around for a while before I heard of it.]

Polls

(JOHN CARUSO) My comments from 1985 that Bruce Linsey quoted last month read, "A pollster goes out and calls and writes his friends to vote, but doesn't do the same for 'Joe Average.' This is where the poll is inaccurate." Bruce Linsey then responds to this by saying last issue, "Agreed, of course, but this does not refer to my handling of the Runestone Poll." Oh, doesn't it? Let's quote what you had to say in 1985 after you ran the poll, "It is true that I solicited ballots from all of my hobby friends," and "The only people I deliberately didn't bother with were those who I knew wouldn't be voting" (plus at least 400 others, according to the census at that time; I'm still wondering how you knew, or deduced, who wouldn't vote) and "I contacted a few dozen people by phone."

By your own admission last issue, you agree that these kind of procedures would make a poll,

any poll, inaccurate, and in the same last issue of *HOL* you deny you did these things. Yet here in print, from your own 1985 comments on the poll are your words that you did *exactly what you claim this year you never did*.

You also continue to call the people who didn't vote "boycotters." I know of no organized boycott. And don't kid yourself—in order to have a boycott, it must be organized. By Bruce Linsey's definition, the first Leeder poll that had only 19 votes was boycotted by the other 700 hobbyists, and the 1985 or 1986 polls were boycotted by over 700 people. But Linsey calls the boycotters "15 or so" of the 700 people who didn't vote.

Bruce Linsey also distorts my position when he infers that my statement meant he had 400 friends because he mailed out 400 ballots. No such thought ever crossed my mind, believe me.

In closing, I think getting over 200 people to respond to any poll, including this poll, within this hobby is a great achievement. It's how the votes were solicited and the accuracy of the poll that was/is in question. You know, the procedure that, at the present, Bruce Linsey denies he used and which he agrees would make the poll inaccurate, yet almost two years ago, a procedure he admitted to utilizing.

[Yeah, but that was two years ago. The situation seems to have calmed down considerably over the last year or so. While you have some good points here, let's try to keep these discussions more current/future related, OK?]

(MARK LARZELERE) I thought that there was going to be an ongoing discussion about the Runestone Poll in *Costaguana*, but it turned out to be just a one-issue deal. A number of people made some good observations about the poll, but I never saw a response from Linsey to them. Perhaps he just doesn't want to change the poll and takes the position that (as Berch said) "if it's not broke, don't fix it."

However, I believe that the poll is broke and needs changes. The main problem is the preference matrix and the determination of what is a zeen. Now, *Appalling Greed*, a one-page sheet of game results, is a zeen, while *Kathy's Kornor* is a subzeen. Does that make any sense?

Remember a few years back when *DipiMaster* topped the poll? A number of people (including Berch/Linsey) chose to just omit *DM* in listing the poll winners. It's hard to blame them for doing that. But if *DM* had been #53, it would have been listed, just like *AG* and *Known*

Game Openings and other small “zeens” get listed.

Basically, the present poll set-up is that there is a set of small zeens that are allowed to finish low in the poll, but are not allowed to top it.

[Well, if you take the view that the preference matrix *is* the poll nowadays, what’s the problem with it? The problem seems to be that most people don’t know how to vote to make their votes count most effectively. Being limited to integer votes doesn’t make it any easier. If you could give full decimal votes and use the decimal just for determining preference that might be a decent compromise.

[The distinction between zeen/subzeen/non-zeen is arbitrary, but what alternatives are there? Similarly, why should *AG* even be rated against service zeens like *KGO* or *Everything* or the *Zeen Register*? *Dipimaster* was ignored because its sole purpose in life was to win the poll. Not that other zeens aren’t around for the same reason, they just aren’t so blatant about it.

[Since you seem to feel that the poll is broken, how do you suggest that it be fixed?]

Publisher’s Handbook

(STEPHEN DORNEMAN) In the discussion on *Once Upon A Deadline*, you tell new pubbers to “invent your own set of basics.” I bet you wouldn’t want to buy a program written by someone who hadn’t studied how programs have been constructed in the past (although some of the documentation on the programs I own reads that way), or listen to music from someone who hadn’t studied the basics of his or her instrument. I see nothing wrong in giving someone a template, or even just a few good rules of thumb, to get them started in any endeavor. Creative people will add to the knowledge of their predecessors to come up with something new and different without being alien to the form. People who slavishly follow the dictates of “The Book” are unlikely to publish in the first place.

[It seems that most of the music I listen to *is* made by people that hadn’t studied the basics of their instrument (formally, at least). Most programs in existence were written by FORTRAN and COBOL hackers who didn’t know the first thing about programming structure, documentation and other modern developments. But I’d like to keep dipzeens as far away from these “serious”

subjects as possible. This is one of the few fields where you *can* get away with winging it and I’d like to see more of that.

[A template is a fine idea. Rules of thumb are peachy keen. *OUAD*, at 200+ pages, is neither.]

(BRUCE LINSEY) Your analogy (in response to Bruce Geryk) that “It’s like learning a language in a class compared to visiting the country” is a good one, at least to some extent. But wouldn’t you at least agree that people should have language classes available if they want them? Not everyone can afford to visit a foreign country just to learn the language...and not everyone who wants to publish can afford (either in terms of money or of time) to study hundreds of other zeens first.

You are also correct to say that winging it may add creativity and spontaneity to a zeen. But won’t you at least concede the point that new publishers who *want* to read a collection of articles on publishing/GMing techniques should have that option available too? That’s all *OUAD* is, you know, an attempt to give this option to people who want it. Nobody has to read it; nobody has to take the advice in it. But there are plenty of people who might *want* to.

[I never said that people *shouldn’t* have the option of reading something that may help them begin publishing. Merely that *OUAD* is *too* thorough. No, if people don’t want to think for themselves, they don’t have to do so. I don’t have to like it, though.

[How expensive can it be to “study” hundreds of other zeens? Send Simon a few bucks at the zeen bank and get a box of the things. That should be plenty enough to get rolling. I’d only seen three zeens when I started publishing (*Graustark*, *Beaucoullion*, *Non Sequitur*). New publishers shouldn’t be afraid to learn as they go.]

(JEFF ZARSE) Like Bruce Geryk (whose arguments you attacked last issue), I’m another new publisher who used *Once Upon a Deadline*—and I, also, found it very useful. *Random Thoughts* is now at issue 2, and I’m sorry to disillusion you that even though I read *OUAD*, I do not publish “by the book.” I publish “with the book.”

It’s not everyday that someone like me (your typical run-of-the-mill hobby nobody) can get the opinions of Coughlan, Linsey, von Metzke, Davis, Smyth, Birsan, Berch, Beyerlein... (well,

you get the idea) on publishing. I'm glad that I can send my \$3 to Dalton, MA and have these people appear on my doorstep. Now, if that isn't a hobby service, I don't know what is.

You raise a valid argument in that hearing these people describe their publishing styles may "take out a certain element of creativity and spontaneity." To respond to this, I'll use myself as an example. The most valuable information I got from this 200+page opus did not come from the dozens of pages devoted to house rules, or artwork, or letter columns, or hobby courtesy. The article in *OUAD* that I found most useful was Mark Berch's four-paragraph blurb on mailing labels (found on page 56, if you're keeping score). The system he describes is simple and ingenious; and most importantly, it's better than any method I had thought of.

I applaud Bruce Linsey and his cast of thousands for presenting me with options I didn't know I had.

[The most valuable bit of info in this 200+page opus turned out to be a four paragraph blurb. That just about sums up my whole case.

[Too bad you consider yourself such a nobody compared to The Great Men you list. It doesn't have to be that way, you know. And I bet if you asked some of those people to give you some pointers, they'd be happy to do so—even eager. Might take a bit more work on your part, but you'd get more out of it.]

(JOHN CARUSO) Since I haven't seen a copy, I can't comment on its content, except for those items I've read from others' comments. I'll pass on that idea, except to ask—is a 200-page "ego-stroking" publication really necessary? How many publishers around today had access to a publisher's handbook before they started? Let alone a 200-page monster. I'm quite sure the same advice could have been given in less than one-quarter of the space, at least in general terms. I'm not so sure that covering every possible angle is so good. After all, for me anyway, part of the fun of publishing was discovering things for myself.

Each person apparently has a differing opinion regarding the value of *OUAD*, just as it should be. Bruce Geryk benefitted from it. Dick Martin did not. Peter Sullivan, Alan Stewart, and Stephen Dorneman are somewhere in between. While I concur with Dick and Peter questioning *OUAD*'s overall usefulness, I agree with Bruce and Stephen that there certainly can be parts in

OUAD that can help someone at least minimally.

Why?

(KEN PEEL) I think that my reason for publishing is different than most. Most pubbers publish because the product thus produced is something they can say, "I did this, and this is me." Whenever I get in this situation, that's when *Politesse* runs into trouble. A quirk of my personality is that I like to make things happen more than I like to do things. I am far from the pure entrepreneurial personality that characterize most pubbers. My particular strength is that generally I work well with others and am good at moving forward cooperative undertakings.

I revived *Politesse* after the Great Crash of 1984 (see Cost section) because its existence was crucial in holding together the local gaming group that had grown up around it. The early revived version was extremely modest, much along the lines of the earliest incarnation of the zeen. Fortunately, after a few months, Ed came back onboard as contributing editor, and things moved along pretty well for a time. Then, Ed dropped out, and I was left to try to keep the thing together all on my own. The several months that this situation went on found *Politesse* at low tide. The quality was poor, the thing was invariably late, and it was invariably dashed off at the last minute.

But after a mercifully short period with this embarrassing product, Ed returned as full Editor, and I think the zeen was at one of its peak, rivaling a very different incarnation in early 1984 (before the big feud really got going). Now, with Ed taking a sabbatical as editor an an indefinite period, the zeen is undergoing a change once again, and who knows what direction it will take? If it were just me alone, I would be pessimistic. But coming onboard will be a new editorial team of Budd Haemer and Marc Hurwitz—the former a steady-handed local player, and the latter a fiery and mercurial postal dipster (and local player, of course). Interestingly, the two of them are old college chums, from Washington University in St. Louis, of all places... All told, a couple of young turks Warthog-wise, with unknown possibilities for the future. New directions are always exciting, and being a part of them (as publisher and legal guardian) is I guess what keeps me around.

One final comment for Les Casey. Don't worry about comparing yourself to other zeens, and don't be spooked by them. Make your zeen

what you want it to be. And don't worry, too, if it doesn't immediately become what you would like. Give yourself room to grow, and just keep trying out new ideas until you hit a stride that feels comfortable. Even among what I consider the best, who can compare a *Rebel* to a *Perelandra* to a *Praxis* to a *KK/W*? All tops in their own class. Hell, some of them define their own class. A lot of what a zeen becomes, too, springs out of the relationship that develops between the pubber and the subbers. That doesn't develop overnight. A final recommendation comes from my own bias: go for novices! Send a game opening notice to Scott Hanson and Robert Sacks. Put a listing in the "Opponents Wanted" section of *The General*. Write to Peery, Woody and Linsey, and ask that they refer novices your way. And, of course, place the gamestore flyer in your area!! You can only take so many players from one area, of course, but the more there are generally, the more there are to go around. But most of all, don't live or die on instant stardom among the old fogey pubbers. Heck, a lot of them don't even play the game anymore.

[Speaking from experience in that regard, you old fogey? I know, you're waiting for Jack to come out of retirement to see if you can do it again. I sure don't play as much as I used to.]

[Ideally, I think each zeen should define it's own class. Who consciously patterns himself after what "kind" of zeen he publishes?]

(PETE GAUGHAN) I publish because it forces me to make contact with people I like who might otherwise never hear from me. Also because I enjoy good writing and want to help others enjoy it too. And because I think I'm damn good at it.

I don't publish because I want dozens of readers, or so I can be more important in the hobby. I hope *Pere* stays out of the mainstream, regardless of its circulation. I don't mind non-participating subscribers—so long as they read and enjoy the zeen.

[How do you know they read and enjoy the zeen if you don't hear from them?]

(MARK BERCH) Why do I publish? For two reasons. There are many old articles, letters, endgame statements, editorials, press items, etc, which are so good they deserve a second audience, so I reprint them. This is especially true for British material, which sometimes presents com-

pletely different points of view than one sees here in American zeens. I usually group these into theme issues. I hope that, at least some of the time, this creates issues that are more than the sum of their parts.

Second, I want a forum where I can say what I want, when I want to say it, and how I want it said. If it's just a single sentence, fine. And if it takes 38 pages (which it did recently), I can do that too. I do this not only for myself, but for others. That is, if someone sees me successful at what I am doing, and enjoying it, then perhaps they will be encouraged to try his or her own hand at a dipzeen. After all, one of the reasons *Diplomacy Digest* got started was that I saw other successful zeens in the hobby, with ideas that I wanted to try. So in a sense, I try to return the favor.

Archives

(STEPHEN DORNEMAN) As far as establishing a Library of Diplomacy goes, I think the effort would be better spent on improving the quality of material currently being published rather than cataloging the past. If a Library of Diplomacy is going to be established anyway, it should be associated with an actual library, where the facilities to store and sort the information already exist, much as a number of university libraries now have SF fanzeen collections. Perhaps a specialized foreign affairs or WWI history library could be approached to see how receptive they might be to such a suggestion. And if you give them a big enough donation along with the collection, I'm sure you could get some attention for the project.

[Now that's an interesting idea: putting the Library in a library. What a concept. How do the SF fanzeen collections work? Of course, they have a longer history than we do—and probably more "famous" writers, who may be of academic interest in their own right. Tell us more: where, what, etc.]

(JEFF ZARSE) I'm glad Peery and Hinton have extensive zeen collections—let's just leave it at that. The Zarse Archives is nothing but a box filled with file folders, and I sometimes feel I have too much "deadwood" in my files. Just how often does Larry or Elmer walk out to the garage and thumb through *Boast* #9? I don't care. Who would?

If this archive hype is anything, it should be a

signal to anyone with back issues of zeens filed away: there will come a point when your collection reaches a given size (100 pounds, arbitrarily) and you will no longer be satisfied with just the zeens you have—You Will Want All of Them!!

[So my piles of zeens in the basement are on the verge of critical mass? Help!

[And I bet Larry will be out in the garage thumbing through *Boast* #9 shortly after reading this. He won't be able to resist.]

(BILL SALVATORE) Regarding people's burning desire to read old diplomags, I have a little story about how I almost got into my first hobby feud, with Ed Wrobel and Ken Peel. At the time when Ed was offering "all the *Politesse* you want for whatever money you choose to send," I sent Ed all my old diplomags (*Toronto Telegram*, etc), which I had gotten when buying people's collections of old hexgaming magazines, as the foundation for a Warthog Library of Diplomacy, asking in exchange a lifetime sub to *Politesse*. Ed honored this until *Politesse* almost died. When Ken took over I stopped getting it. Upon getting a free sample some time later, I inquired, and Ken told me that he had discussed this with Ed, Ed had told him to give me a year free, and he had decided to give me two years free. I sent him a few bits of weirdness in the course of our correspondence, and for a time things went along smoothly. Later, Ken upbraided me for neither contributing to *Politesse* nor attending Warthog game-meets and threatened to curtail my free sub. I replied that he had picked up the falling torch from Ed, taking over both the name and the concept from Ed, and that therefore he was ethically obliged to honor my lifetime sub. He replied, in effect, oh yeah, well this is where the free ride ends, smartass! I continued by saying that in that case he should return the old diplomags. He described them as some pounds of trash which Ed had thrown out long ago(!), but in their place sent me a box of miscellany which he had intended to contribute to PDORA. In further correspondence, I explained that I *had* nothing to contribute to *Politesse*, except my issues of *Firebrands* which I had sent to Ed some months before because my gaming interests were in areas other than mostly-negotiational games, and that I could not go to Warthog meetings because I did not *have* large blocks of FTF time because of my family responsibilities, and I sent money. So now I am a paid-up *Politesse* subber, and any bad feelings have evidently been smoothed over, but

the whole incident speaks pungently about the generally-held value of old diplomags. Out with the trash, forsooth! The box Ken sent me, I have contributed to PDORA.

[Old *Toronto Telegrams* are treasures! Anyone who tells you otherwise has no taste in sick humor. I think I'll reprint those Cat Discipline articles...again....]

(PETER SULLIVAN) Archives? "He who controls the present controls the past; He who controls the past controls the future."—George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

["Those who would repeat the past must control the teaching of history."—Frank Herbert, *Chapterhouse: Dune*.]

(DAVE MCCRUMB) What the advantages of having an archives are, I have no idea. Maybe in fifty years or so someone will do a thesis on the weird Diplomacy subculture and use the archives as research material. Other than that, I can see no reason to have one except to be able to pull out good articles that can be republished. But since the really good articles tend to be republished periodically anyway, what's the point?

Some people like to keep and store things. If this extends to Diplomacy magazines, that's their problem. As long as I don't have to put up with it, I don't mind. Hell, I throw away most of the zeens I receive that are over a year old. Especially the ones that fold before issue 10.

(JOHN CARUSO) Yes, I feel there should be at least one main Archive for Dipdom, whether it's necessary for research or not. Archives contain history, some important, some not, but all should be saved. Four to five regional archives with one main central archives? Now that's food for thought. But who to be the four to five? And the "one"?

[Why would these archives have to be as formal as you seem to imply? I keep tons of old zeens, which could probably qualify as an archive. But I just choose to call them a bunch of old zeens, stuffed in boxes.]

(CONRAD VON METZKE) It is arguable just what value an archive of the Diplomacy emissions can have. Some people, like Larry and Elmer, consider it of extreme importance. Others—I'm one of those—don't really have much interest.

Certainly if someone wants to set one up, or expand on an existing collection, there's no reason not to, and I'll cheerfully contribute my effusions.

But the idea of anyone seriously delving into a massive archive to do research in the History of Postal Diplomacy strikes me as ludicrous. Mark Berch and Walt Buchanan are really about the only two who have ever done any creative delving and come up with anything worth having.

Rod Walker recently came up with what I think is a useful compromise. He proposes to set up an archive solely of the "worthwhile" material and ignoring all the chaff. He would center on zeens which ran useful articles, carried significant discussions, or in some other way made a significant contribution to hobby development. There is the question of criteria here: who would establish them, what would be excluded, and why, and what happens if someone disagrees on exclusion, and so on and on. But if these issues could be successfully addressed, then the system might just work, and would certainly save the fruitless search for the mountains of useless rubbish that we have generated over the last quarter century.

Rod's idea has one other value: it makes the job within the realm of possibility. If very much more than that is attempted, I rather think it will never be finished. Assuming Rod follows through, or someone using his thesis does, that one might just be possible. Furthermore, tangible results would be quick in coming.

[Carefully reading thousands of zeens (preferably by more than one reader) to determine "worthwhile" articles puts an archives in the realm of the possible? Easier just to file everything! It may take more space, but should take much less time to do.

[How do you really determine what's chaff and what's not? That would have to be a totally subjective opinion, and one that's not likely to be universally shared. I have a feeling that most of what Rod considers to be "worthwhile" would have been written by Rod himself.

[While it's extremely unlikely that anyone will do any serious research on Dipdom, it's not impossible. After all, who'd think of doing "research" on American Pop Music? But it's out there. Maybe some starving PhD student will stumble on Dipdom as a dissertation topic.]

(BOB OLSEN) Offhand, like you, I can't see much use for an archive of old Dipzinnies, though that's not to say that someone else wouldn't. To me, there's nothing less interesting (well, maybe a

few things) than old news...even the better zinnies don't read that well after a few years. A complete archives might attract the odd thesis-desperate graduate student (journalism? psychiatry?), but it's hard to see what else they'd be good for. Still, I can appreciate the pleasures of having everything sorted out neatly and indexed just so as an end in itself.

[I don't know, Bob, the old zeens I read are usually pretty hilarious. Hindsight is a wonderful thing.]

(KEN PEEL) The main worth of maintaining one or several archives with as complete as possible a collection of dipzeens is—like insurance—simply the knowledge that they exist. I seriously doubt that they would ever be used much. What was the "check-out" rate at the old Hoosier Archives, I wonder? Worse than the Maytag repairman, I would wager. But the worth of history is not necessarily what use we can make of it. As many wrong lessons are learned from history as right ones (the "lessons" of Munich got us into Vietnam, and the "lessons" of Vietnam make the world a more dangerous place as the US withdrew into its shell for a number of years following that tragic fiasco). But history doesn't need any excuse for its preservation; it exists for its own sake.

There are in this world, and perhaps even among our own midst, a small number of true archival personalities. Walt Buchanan was one of these. But watch out, I say, for anyone who has the need to proclaim himself as The One True Omnipotent Hobby Archivist To Whom All Must Bow And Send Free Zeens Lest They Burn Forever In Purgatory. The main purpose the concept of hobby archives have been put to lately is the avocation of arguing over them.

But back to the archival personality. Perhaps of even greater utility than peace of mind, archives built and maintained by people who loved what they were doing would allow someone truly interested in archival activities to take the effort upon himself or herself and just quietly get on with the business, having a hell of a time in the process. Now, that's what I call a good use of an archive. Now, if in the process a nearly complete archive of Dipdom gets built, catalogued and indexed—and someone actually finds a use for it—so much the better. The archivist(s) would benefit from the challenge of the undertaking, and the rest of us would benefit, perhaps, from the knowledge that the early years of Dipdom live on. But who could do it? Melinda could, if she got a bee in her bon-

net about it, but then, Melinda could do anything if she had the interest. One thing I feel pretty certain about, though, is that the people not to do it are those who spend their time jockeying with each other in effusive self-proclamation. Not that I mind them trying, mind you, but I just don't see a lot of actual doing. It seems to me that a successful archivist will concentrate on the doing and avoid the silly game of "it's mine, no, it's mine, no it's mine!" Or am I all wet?

[No, you seem pretty dry to me. Ultimately, the only way an archive will be built is by someone just sitting down and getting to it. That's the *only* way that anything seems to get done in Diplomacy. Talk about titles, whether Archivist, archivist, or @rchivist, only produces reams of material to be filed away—and none of the work actually gets done.]

(LARRY PEERY) Yes, just in case you were wondering, there really is a Diplomacy Archives. Actually there are several collections of Diplomacy publications that claim that title, but I'm not interested in that. What I am interested in is preserving and protecting as much of the hobby's vast literary output as possible.

That could be a full-time hobby commitment, if anyone was interested in doing it. Unfortunately, at the moment no one is both interested and qualified enough to offer a last sanctuary for Diplomacy of gaming memorabilia that would otherwise be lost forever. However, to get the most out of our limited time for this project, we'd like to request your help. If you are a publisher or prolific hobby writer at some point, you'll have to decide what to do with your collection of hobby related materials. That decision is up to you, of course, but we are there if you need us.

But during the time when you are writing, or publishing, or collecting Diplomacy publications, etc, you can still help us, or any other archives, by taking a few minutes of your time to save us a lot of time later. There is nothing more frustrating for an archivist than to receive a large box (or boxes) of materials that have just been dumped into a box and mailed. Of course, if that's how you keep your files, so be it. Still, one thing I've noticed in examining the personal archives of people like Don Miller and Doug Beyerlein is that they did organize their collections so that they could be used by themselves. And, by doing so, they made it simple for me to come along later and arrange their materials within the larger Archives. That's a big help.

Most people just start collecting stuff, without any preconceived notion of what they are going to do with it. As magazines come in, they go into a box, or they go onto a shelf. With luck, they are alphabetized and put in numerical or chronological order. Games and correspondence are usually arranged by Boardman Numbers. And any author worth his salt keeps a file of everything he's written about the game or hobby. Those are the basics, and they help a lot.

But at some point, the challenge becomes overwhelming, and either the system isn't up to the task, or the collector simply becomes too busy collecting to take the time to sit back and analyze what he has and how it can best be organized. Chaos results.

So, our first bit of advice is to find a system that you can live with and one you will use. And then stick with it. And be sure to write down what it is and put that somewhere in your papers. Also, if you haven't told anyone what you want done with your materials if "something happens to you," you should write that down also and make sure someone knows where that paper is. In a way, it's like writing a will. People, especially Diplomacy players, hate to do it, of course, because it smacks of mortality, and who among us wishes to admit that we are mortal? God knows, we have enough trouble just admitting we can and do make mistakes from time to time.

Once you've designed a system (and remember to keep it flexible because it is going to have to be able to expand and encompass new things as your hobby career advances), you need to implement it. Most systems consist of three parts: the index, the sorting & classification, and the storage.

Any worthwhile archives needs an index. That can consist of nothing more than a bunch of three by five cards in a suitable container. Using different colored cards for different purposes is a good idea. For instance, you might use white cards for individual's names, blue cards for magazine titles, green cards for game records, and yellow cards for everything else. Again, you should devise a standardized system of notation for recording information on the cards. Each card should have a number or a title which corresponds to the given file. Cross-indexing is nice, but don't get carried away with it, or you'll spend all your time shuffling cards. Obviously, if you have computer, there are all kinds of computer programs designed for this sort of task. So find one you like and use it. Just be sure to allow yourself plenty of room on those disks for expansion. Fig-

ure out what you need and then triple it and you should be safe for a while. And be sure to run a printout of your files from time to time for those who can't use a computer. It's always good to have a backup copy somewhere. But start with a simple index system using zine titles, individual names (person, event, article title, etc), and Boardman or Miller Numbers for games. You can devise your own system if you do a lot of face-to-face or con/tournament playing.

Sorting & classification is a drag and nobody likes to do it. So make it as painless on yourself as possible. Try to get someone to help you if you've got a lot of stuff to sort through. Put on a good record, open up a beer, and be sure to leave yourself if you've got a whole lot of stuff. Tackling the chore once a month, once a quarter, or (God forbid!) once a year is enough. On your first sort, go by alphabetical listings. Put individual zine titles together, correspondence relating to a single game (or written by a single author) together. Then go back and put each zine file in order by number or by date. Arrange correspondence by Boardman Number or date. All this assumes that magazines are given numbers and letters are dated. If they aren't, and you notice it when you get them, put one on them for future use. Be sure to note if you are missing any issues of a publication you subscribe to. If you are, get a duplicate ordered while you are thinking about it. If you don't do it now, you'll probably forget about it. When you've got things sorted out, give yourself a break and stretch your legs. If you've run true to form, by this time, you'll be on the floor, surrounded by dozens or scores of little piles of papers. [Your fantasy come true, eh? - DM] You deserve a break.

Storage is a two-step process. Some things, like game records, basic reference works (like *DD*, *BBB*, etc) should remain on a shelf somewhere near where you work. Then, when they are no longer needed, they can be stored permanently (or if you don't like to keep things, shipped off to an archivist) in your attic, basement, garage, or wherever you have room for them. For long term storage, try to find similar boxes that can be sealed and stacked. If you want to use Banker's Boxes, go ahead, but almost anything will do if it is clean and sturdy. Depending on the amount of material you have, you may want to arrange your correspondence, game records, etc, in one box and your magazines, etc, in another box. If you don't have a lot of material, you may combine the two in a single box, preferably for a year at a time. Label each box by putting a list of what's in it on

it (tape it to the side of the box that will be seen). Put a list of what's in the box in the box for the future archivist to use. Close, but don't seal the box. Later, when you want to dispose of the box, seal it, remove the outside list and keep that for your records, and send it off to the archives.

Some people like to bind their magazine collections in binders. Some prefer to keep them in open files which are sometimes easier to work with and don't damage the magazines. I don't really care one way or the other, myself, since copies in both formats are needed by the archives. Bound volumes are easier to keep on the shelf for reference, but individual copies are much easier to loan out or copy.

When you send your collection off to the archivist, you should include a letter specifying your wishes in regards to two things. First, if you've included personal correspondence or game records, are you giving the archivist permission to loan out or copy that material? If you want a restriction placed on it, say so. Most game records should probably be sealed for a year before they are released. Personal correspondence is a bit trickier. Some things can be released immediately, but some things should never see the light of day. But if you don't specify, you'll have to depend on the judgement of the archivist. Second, do you want your collection kept intact, or used to supplement the archives? A complete collection is useful to anyone studying the work of a specific individual, but it's a pain to an archivist who is trying to put together a complete set of a particular title. Fortunately, the Archives here contain enough duplicates and triplicates that most important collections can be kept intact.

I know all this sounds pretty dry, and it is. But it is also fundamental to the preservation of our hobby's past. We've lost too much of our heritage in years gone by because of neglect and ignorance. Hopefully this will convince you to take some basic steps to make sure that that doesn't happen to your collection. After all, remember that old swap meet adage, "One man's trash is another man's treasure."

[I'd think game correspondence could be released immediately upon the conclusion of the game, and personal correspondence (if you got any) should be held back. Not that anybody would really want to look at that stuff from most people.

[Since you're going to maintain thorough indexes, keeping collections together isn't that important (as long as everything is accounted for in

some way).]

(JULIE MARTIN) I worked as an archivist in the manuscripts collection of the History of Medicine Division of the National Library of Medicine at NIH for two summers. The first summer I helped a team of two students finish up a collection of approximately 20,000 items which they had been working on for over a year. The second summer, I did a collection of about 5,000 items by myself from start to finish in about two months, that is about 300 hours. The amount of time needed to archive a collection increases at least geometrically, if not exponentially, with the increase in its volume.

The first job, which should take 25-30% of your time if you're doing the job right, is to look through the collection and get an idea of what's there. Is the collection primarily letters? Are they private letters, or business letters? What individuals or organizations are the major correspondents? Are there large groups of other material, such as unpublished manuscripts, published articles, newspaper clippings, grocery lists, miscellaneous bulky items? (For example, there were a bunch of dolls with a nurses association's collection.) Also at this time you begin to consider whether you will be organizing the collection chronologically, or alphabetically by individual name, or alphabetically by organization name, or whatever scheme seems to represent the collection best.

The next job, which should take 50-65% of your time, is going carefully through the collection, item by item, and deciding where to file it (including the circular file). This is not necessarily easy. You have to at least skim letters for their content, and actually read quite a few to make sure that they are worth keeping, *i.e.*, not duplicates, not grocery lists or one-line notes. If you are filing chronologically, you will discover that many people leave out the year in dates, or omit the date altogether. You must try to figure out at least an approximate date, usually from the content, or from letters filed nearby. If you are filing by individual name, you may have to puzzle out the signature. When you decide what heading an item should go under, you should label the item in pencil in a noticeable place, like the top of the letter, so that if falls on the floor, you'll know where to refile it. Also at this time, you must be sure to remove staples, paper clips, rubber bands, and like items which may rust or melt or otherwise destroy your documents. Newspaper clippings are usually not kept because they are available from other sources and because the newspaper has a high

acid content which yellows and eventually destroys the paper. Envelopes are not usually kept because they are sticky and a lot of bulk for not much information. If the addresses aren't on the letters, however, you may want or need to save envelopes.

The last job, which should take about 15-20% of your time, is the final organization of the collection. You make up file folders for the manuscripts, labelling the folders, and putting not too many items in each folder, say around 25. Then you put the file folders in file boxes, labelling the boxes, and filling the boxes fairly tightly since the paper will smooth out and compress over time. Then you make up a detailed index, perhaps with cross-references, for the boxes, and store the boxes in a nice, cool, dry place. The folders should be acid-free (means expensive) and the boxes should be at least dust-resistant.

You must keep in mind at all times that you are organizing this material to help a researcher who will never have the benefit of looking at the whole collection as you did. What you decide to keep and how you decide to organize it may have a great influence on the how the researcher ends up seeing the individual or organization represented by the archive.

The point of all this is that it takes a *lot* of time to properly do an archive, a lot more time than anyone up to now seems to have acknowledged. It can also be fairly expensive. The acid-free folders we used, for example, cost about 40¢ apiece. It is also difficult to do a collection to which a lot of material still may be added. The new material may completely change the organizational scheme you'd want to use, or at least make you do a lot of shifting in your existing scheme.

I started one summer to try and organize Dick's collection, then about five years old, and about ten xerox paper boxes worth. The zeens were easy, and I got those done in a week. Then I started on the letters. I got about halfway through one box before I gave up. It just didn't seem worth it for a collection that no one but us would probably ever see or use. How much more worthwhile is the years of work a Dipdom archive would take?

[I sure wouldn't want to have to do it, that's for sure! Just looking at all those boxes of paper is enough to discourage me. Of course, if I did re-organize the files, I'd never be able to find anything. Right now I have at least a decent idea where I can find any particular item on the rare occasions that I actually look through the stuff. Can't bring myself to toss it all, though.]

(continued from page 1)

general sorts of things that every GM faces. We haven't been getting that sort of stuff lately, so the category has been discontinued.

Filing Systems ★★★ How do you keep track of all the paperwork, orders, addresses, etc.

Finding New Subbers ★★★ Ways to recruit new players and subbers, both to a particular zeen and for Dipdom in general.

GMing Procedures ★★★ How you adjudicate games, manage standby lists, organize house-rules, and report games.

Irregular Games ★★★ What makes a game "irregular," and why. Also discontinued, though maybe should be revived.

Old Guard ★★★ A list of zeens in publication since 1982.

Out Of Dipdom Experiences ★★★ How did you find your way into postal Dipdom in the first place? Also experiences in other hobbies besides postal Dip, including chess and Irish ceili dancing. My personal favorite category.

PBEM ★★★ Electronic mail Diplomacy, long discontinued.

Polls ★★★ Discussing the merits and demerits of the various polls, and publisher reaction to them.

Publisher's Handbook ★★★ Comments on the handbook, *Once Upon A Deadline*.

Why? ★★★ What makes you spend your time at a typewriter or computer terminal when you could be out on a nice day like this?

New Business: Burnout

BY STEVE LANGLEY

Doesn't asking someone experiencing burnout to write an article seem sort of futile? As it turns out, my burnout seems to have just been a bout with depression. I have taken interest in my games again, and even look forward to the mail. Still, I can tell you a bit about how it felt.

To start, remember your novice days? When every piece of mail was eagerly torn into and every zine was avidly read and commented upon. When visions of blocks filled every daydream moment, and most night dreams were of conquering Europe. Picture instead a dread of opening your mail that is equally strong as the novice eagerness.

Picture zines set aside, unopened, for when you feel up to reading them. Picture a stack of unanswered mail so large that it will all be totally dated by the time you get it read, much less answered.

Fresh Fruits

The following folks have expressed an interest in postal Dip lately. Send them a sample!

Scott Beckett, 5348 Tall Tree Way, West Chester, OH 45069

John Caruso, 29-10 164th St, Flushing, NY 11358-1428

Ed Czechowski Jr, 3306 Elm St, Toledo, OH 43608

Phil Geusz, 1521 West Field, Ellisville, MO 63011

Tim Heath, 6749 Benton St, Arvada, CO 80003

Paul Mills, 2564 Prarieview Ln S, Aurora, IL 60504

Eric Mitchell, 1112 Flowering Tree Ct, Gambrills, MD 21054

Gregory Smith, 618 Skyview Dr, Nashville, TN 37206

Stephen Squibb, 377 Mooredale Rd, Carlisle, PA 17013

Mark Stewart, 1420 W 2nd Ave, Oshkosh, WI 54901

Larry Stone, 1924 Stevens Ave S, #7, Minneapolis, MN 55403

What are you doing on this list, Caruso!

Correction: *Appalling Greed* should have been on the Old Guard list last time. I don't know the exact date, but AG is definitely still around and pre-82. Also, maybe *Perelandra* belongs too. It folded, but was barely cold in the grave before reviving. *Pere* started in 82?

Picture sending in moves without analysis, just to fend off NMR, in hopes that "next month" you'll do better. Picture considering resignation before you NMR out, but not quite enough energy to write the resignation, and not quite enough character to admit you can't play the game to completion, even though all evidence shows that you are not playing the game. That's what it was like.

At the same time, there was guilt, of course. Guilt over letters not read, alliances not supported, friends and allies let down.

In my case, it was depression, not burnout, and so perhaps burnout is different. Still, that is what I felt and, at the same time, I felt it was burnout. Since the depression lifted, I've started to read my mail and answer it and plot and scheme as of old.

[I sure know how you feel, does anybody else? See y'all in about a month!]

Ze Zubzcriber Litz

11	Les Casey	33 Nestow Dr, Nepean, Ont, CAN K2G 4J7
12	Bob Olsen	6818 Winterberry Cir, Wichita, KS 67226-1253
12	Russ Rusnak	900 N Rohlwing Rd, #333, Addison, IL 60101-1009
12	Larry Peery	PO Box 8416, San Diego, CA 92102-0416
13	Andy Lischett	2402 S Ridgeland Ave, Berwyn, IL 60402-2431
14	Mark Larzelere	7607 Fontainebleau, #2352, New Carrollton, MD 20784-3820
14	Mark Berch	492 Naylor Pl, Alexandria, VA 22304-2227
15	Steve Langley	2296 Eden Roc Ln, #1, Sacramento, CA 95825-3350
15	Stephen Dorneman	95 Federal St, #2, Lynn, MA 01905-2230
16	Bruce Linsey	73 Ashuelot St, #3, Dalton, MA 01226
16	Bill Becker	1515 Ridgewood, Jenison, MI 49428
18	Jim Burgess	100 Holden St, 3rd Left, Providence, RI 02908-5731
20	Steve Emmert	PO Box 319, Virginia Beach, VA 23458-0319
21	Pete Gaughan	3121 E Park Row, #165, Arlington, TX 76010-3744
C	Rex Martin	4517 Harford Rd, Baltimore, MD 21214
T	Robert Sacks	4861 Broadway, 5-V, New York, NY 10034-3139
T	Malcolm Smith	Odvar Solbergsvei 206, 0973 Oslo 9, Norway
T	Paul Gardner	RR #1, Box 2338, Newfane, VT 05345-9734
T	Hugh Christie	43 E Houston Ave, Montgomery, PA 17752-1104
T	Kevin Tighe	2351 Westwood Ct, #F8, Arcata, CA 95521-5156
T	Conrad von Metzke	4374 Donald Ave, San Diego, CA 92117-3813
T	Alan Stewart	702-25 St Mary St, Toronto, Ont, CAN M4Y 1R2
T	Peter Sullivan	St Chad's College, 18, North Bailey, Durham, UK DH1 3RH
T	Ken Peel	8708 First Ave, #T2, Silver Spring, MD 20910-3555
T	Scott Hanson	3508 4th Ave S, Minneapolis, MN 55408-4511
T	Bruce Geryk	5748 S Blackstone Ave, #206, Chicago, IL 60637
T	John Caruso	29-10 164th St, Flushing, NY 11358-1428
T	Melinda Holley	PO Box 2793, Huntington, WV 25727-2793
T	Rory Noble	436 S 10th St, St Helens, OR 97051
T	Simon Billenness	630 Victory Blvd, #6F, Staten Island, NY 10301-3521
T	David McCrumb	Rt 1, Box 109, New Castle, VA 24127-9601
T	Wallace Nicoll	228 Kinnell Ave, Cardonald, Glasgow, SCOT G52 3RU

So tell me, is this right for everybody? Nobody's moved on me lately, have you?

Handicap the Poll! My picks for #1: **Europa Express** 70%; **Blunt Instruments**, 10%; **Praxis** 10%, **It's A Trap!** 5%, **Costaguana** 5%. So who do you think will win this year?

Dick Martin
26 Orchard Way North
Rockville, MD 20854-6128

1987 RUNESTONE ZINE POLL BALLOT

_____ The Abyssinian Prince	_____ Foundation	_____ Politesse
_____ The Alamo City Times	_____ Frobozz	_____ Pommes Mit Mayo
_____ Alpha & Omega	_____ The Camer's Zine (CT)	_____ Pontevedria
_____ The Appalachian General	_____ Gentleman's Agreement	_____ Praxis
_____ Appalling Greed	_____ Graustark	_____ The Prince
_____ The Armchair Diplomat	_____ Hai! Jikai!	_____ Protozoan
_____ Bersaglieri	_____ Hansard	_____ Random Thought
_____ Blunt Instruments	_____ The Home Office	_____ Rebel
_____ Boast	_____ House of Lords	_____ Redwood Curtain
_____ Bushwacker	_____ It's a Trap!	_____ Retaliation
_____ The Canadian Diplomat	_____ Kalissa	_____ Scipionibus
_____ Cathy's Ramblings	_____ Kathy's Korner/Whitestonia	_____ Send Me a Postcard
_____ Cheeseecake	_____ The King's Court	_____ Sleepless Knights
_____ The Communist Diner	_____ Know Your Enemy	_____ Tacky
_____ Costaguana	_____ Known Game Openings	_____ Ter-ran
_____ Diplomacy Digest	_____ Life of Monty	_____ This Bud's for You
_____ Diplomacy World	_____ Lone Star Diplomat	_____ Vertigo
_____ Diplomag	_____ Magus	_____ The Volcano City News
_____ The Diplomat	_____ The Messenger	_____ The Vortex
_____ The Diplomatic Rag	_____ Microphage	_____ Who Cares?
_____ Dippy (Jim Benes' zine)	_____ No Fixed Address	_____ Zimianvia
_____ The Dragon's Lair	_____ Ohio Acres	_____ The Zine Register
_____ Europa Express	_____ The Orphanage	_____ <u>The Book Report</u>
_____ Everything	_____ Quinipique	_____ <u>Not New York</u>
_____ Feuilletonist's Forum	_____ Over There	_____ <u>PBM</u>
_____ Flick of the Wrist	_____ Paranoiacs' Monthly	_____ <u>Perelandra</u>
_____ Fol Si Fle	_____ Penguin Dip	_____ <u>Yes Virginia... Santa Claus</u>
		_____ (Blank spaces are for any I've neglected to list.)

INSTRUCTIONS: You may rate any publication substantially devoted to Diplomacy of which you have seen at least two issues since April 1, 1986, and which has been published in 1987. Rate each zine on a scale of 0 to 10 (0 being the lowest possible vote, 10 the highest). No fractions, please. Do not rate your own publication. Please rate North American zines only, though any readers living outside North America are welcome to participate.

1987 RUNESTONE SUBZINE POLL BALLOT

_____ At Your Service	_____ Life Goes On	_____ Shadowplay
_____ Big Hits of Mid-America	_____ Magnificent 7	_____ Submarine Warfare
_____ Bottoms Up	_____ Meeting of Minds	_____ Mail of Agency, Mystery
_____ Debl's Filler	_____ The Megadiplomat	_____ (Time) Lording It
_____ Diplodocus	_____ The Mainbone Herald	_____ <u>Atreity Exhibition</u>
_____ Fiat Bellum	_____ Only Yesterday	_____ <u>Erehwan</u>
_____ Hare of the Dog	_____ Out to Pasture	_____ <u>Stab-back</u>
_____ High Inertia	_____ The President's Brain...	_____ <u>Utilize the Cone</u>
_____ High Plains Conzo	_____ Semi-instant Replay	_____ <u>Congressional Page</u>
		_____ (Blank spaces are for any I've neglected to list.)

INSTRUCTIONS: The same as for the Zine Poll -- 0 to 10 scale, do not rate your own publication, etc.

1987 RUNESTONE CM POLL BALLOT

Please list CMs alphabetically by surname, going down the columns.

Vote	CM's Name	Vote	CM's Name	Vote	CM's Name
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

INSTRUCTIONS: You may rate any Diplomacy CM in whose postal game or games you were a player at any time after April 1, 1986, and under whom you played for long enough to gain an objective assessment of his or her competence as a CM. Gamemasters may not rate themselves. Rate each CM by NAME, not by zine. Distinguish between Ron Brown of California and Ron Brown of Canada if you vote for either or both. Again, the rating scale is from 0 to 10, with 0 being the lowest possible vote and 10 the highest. No fractions, please. Rate North American CMs only, though any players living outside North America are welcome to participate.

CONTEST FOR GERMAN DIPLOMACY SET

Yes, I would like to try and win the free, brand new German Diplomacy game!

Print neatly:

Name _____ Phone (optional) _____

Address _____

The zine I predict will win the 1987 Runestone Poll is _____

Rules

1. You must vote in the Poll and correctly guess the winning zine to be eligible for the prize.
2. The winner will be selected randomly from among all eligible entrants. The random drawing will be performed by Nelson Heintzman.
3. The winner's name will be published in The Cream Shall Rise! along with the Poll results.
4. People involved in collecting ballots for the Poll (Bruce Linsey, Nelson Heintzman, and Derek Caws) are not eligible to win.
5. The winner will be notified and allowed, at his or her discretion, to take a U.S. Diplomacy set or a \$30.00 cash prize in lieu of the German Diplomacy set.

Send your ballot to Bruce Linsey, 73 Ashuelot St., Apt. 3, Dalton, MA 01226 (USA) or to Nelson Heintzman, P.O. Box 203, Bowmansville, NY 14026 (USA). Deadline for votes to Bruce is June 27, 1987. Deadline for votes to Nelson is June 20, 1987.

All votes will be held in strict confidence. A voter list will be published again this year.

IF YOU WISH TO RECEIVE THE POLL RESULTS BY MAIL, check this space _____ and enclose \$1.00 U.S. (to Bruce Linsey) with your ballot. The results publication is called The Cream Shall Rise! it will contain an in-depth statistical analysis of the voting and much more. Publication date will be in July.

Indicate one way in which you participate in the North American Diplomacy hobby

(sub to Zine XXX, play in game 1986YY, etc.) _____

Signature _____

Print your name neatly _____ (if your ballot isn't signed, or I can't tell who you are, it will not be counted!)

DIPLOMACY ALLIANCE
AGAINST CANCER
1021 Penn Circle
Apartment E402
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Dear Friends,

I don't have to tell any of you how desperate the need is for a cure to cancer. Almost all of us have experienced the pain of witnessing the cancer death of a relative or friend. Some of us have been blessed by the sight of a relative or friend being healed with skilled care and powerful medicine -- opportunities that did not exist just a few years ago. Please think back for a moment about that person you know who had to struggle with cancer -- struggle to live, to understand, to cope. Consider that much of their pain and yours came from feeling helpless. Now I ask you all, in the name and memory of that person, to read on and think about a simple, quick, and practical way of showing your love and helping to fight cancer.

This year's Runestone Poll is launching a pledge-drive to raise urgently-needed funds for the American Cancer Society. To support the work of the Cancer Society, simply take one or more of these quick steps: (1) Vote in the Poll. Since pledges for the drive are based on the number of votes cast, your vote automatically boosts the amount the Cancer Society will receive. (2) Urge your fellow hobbyists to vote in the Poll. (3) Make a pledge per ballot, keeping in mind that you must be able to honor that pledge no matter how large the turnout is (usually several hundred people). And just think -- if you pledge 5¢ a vote, you'll be contributing the cost of a dinner, a couple of movie tickets, a record or two. We spend this kind of money every week. Isn't a cancer cure worth this kind of investment, too? Remember, sometime there will be a dollar that puts research funds over the edge and pays for the cure to cancer. It could be yours -- but only if you participate.

All pledges must be in to me at the above address by JUNE 27, 1987. When the Poll results are published, please look for the listing of the number of voters. Then multiply that by your original pledge, make a check or money order out to me (Linda Courtemanche), and drop it in the mail by SEPTEMBER 1, 1987. I will write a total check to the American Cancer Society on behalf of the postal Diplomacy hobby.

Being a postal gamer and publisher, I have seen repeatedly the power and success of a Diplomacy alliance when 2 or more people cooperate toward a common goal. Now all of us -- Diplomacy hobbyists and friends -- can ally against cancer just by filling out the pledge-card below, signing it and returning it to me as soon as possible.

Your vote can save lives. Please join us.

Thank you.

Linda Courtemanche
Linda Courtemanche

((I will be glad to start the ball rolling with a 5¢ per ballot pledge. Many, many thanks to Linda for being kind enough to run this drive. I hope you'll all be able to help us out. Pledge forms may be returned to Linda directly, or to me with your Runestone Poll ballot and I'll forward them. -- Bruce Linsey))

I, _____, PLEDGE TO CONTRIBUTE _____ FOR EVERY
BALLOT CAST IN THE 1987 RUNESTONE POLL. I UNDERSTAND THAT THE SUM TOTAL
OF MY CONTRIBUTION WILL BE SENT TO THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY.

(Signature) _____ (Address)

(Date) _____ (Check here if you wish your contribution to be
anonymous.)

DIPCON 1987 PRE-REGISTRATION FORM

University of Wisconsin - Madison
Memorial Union
Madison, Wisconsin
June 5-7, 1987

Please use this form or a duplicate to pre-register for DIPCON '87, and to reserve a room in Lowell Hall, located two blocks from the Memorial Union. Room reservation will include a parking space for each person. If you wish more information on facilities or traveling, please contact Marc or Debi Peters, 1814 Cameron Drive #3, Madison, WI 53711 USA, or call (608) 273-0983.

Send completed forms to Mark Frueh, DipCon Registration, 4320 Wallace Street, St. Louis, MO 63116 USA.

****IMPORTANT!**** Please make out SEPARATE checks for lodging and DipCon registration. Checks for DipCon '87 should be made out to "DipCon Administrative Committee". Checks for lodging reservations should be made out to "Lowell Hall".

Also, we are considering a Titan tournament to be held probably on Saturday. If you are interested, please indicate by checking off the last line on this page.
=====

SEND MY CONFIRMATION OF REGISTRATION TO:

Name:
Address:
City, State:
(Country), Zip:

Please pre-register () person(s) for DIPCON '87 at \$10.00 per person. (University of Wisconsin students \$8.00)
(Make this check out to "DipCon Administrative Committee".)

NAMES OF THOSE ATTENDING: _____

LOWELL HALL RESERVATIONS (Make checks out to "Lowell Hall".)
FULL ROOM--two persons per room:

- () Friday and Saturday night...\$66.00
- () Friday night only.....\$33.00
- () Saturday night only.....\$33.00

HALF ROOM--share with someone else:

- () Friday and Saturday night...\$33.00
- () Friday night only.....\$16.50
- () Saturday night only.....\$16.50

IF SHARING A HALF ROOM:

- () I wish to share with
- () Please match me with another single registrant.

() Yes, I would be interested in a Titan Tournament.